DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 251 CS 502 929

AUTHOR McCauliff, Mary Lou; Askew, Ken E., Jr.
TITLE Availability Data and Recruitability Factors for Academic Units Within Communications and Fine Arts.
INSTITUTION Southern Illinois Univ., Carbondale.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 249p.; Not available in paper copy due to small print.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Affirmative Action; *Educational Research; Employment Opportunities; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Faculty Recruitment; *Females; *Fine Arts; Higher Education; *Minority Groups; *Speech Communication; Teacher Integration

ABSTRACT

This report presents information drawn from a two-part study undertaken by the College of Communications and Fine Arts at Southern Illinois University (Carbondale) as part of that university's affirmative action efforts with regard to recruiting and hiring minority group members and females. The first chapter of the report presents the background of the study, its rationale, and its objectives. The second chapter discusses each of the two phases of the study. (The first phase concerned the gathering of availability data to be used in generating affirmative action goals for the eight academic areas within the College and for similar areas at other universities; the second phase sought to determine what percentage of females and minorities identified in Phase One were "recruitable.") The third chapter presents an analysis of Phase One results for the areas of art, music, radio and television, theatre, speech pathology and audiology, speech communication, cinema, photography, and journalism and Phase Two results for the areas of music, radio and television, theatre, speech pathology and audiology, speech communication, cinema, and journalism. The fourth chapter offers conclusions. Seven appendixes provide lists of graduate program directories, of programs offering degrees required for faculty employment in the College of Communications and Fine Arts, and of professional organization membership directories, as well as copies of forms used in each phase of the study. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AVAILABILITY DATA AND RECRUITABILITY FACTORS FOR ACADEMIC UNITS WITHIN COMMUNICATIONS AND FINE ARTS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BY

Mary Lou McCauliff, Ph.D.

Principal Investigator

and

Ken E. Askew, Jr.

Research Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Lou McCauliff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Southern Illinois University

October, 1979

This project was funded by the Dean's Office, College of Communications and Fine Arts, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois

ED188251

CS502929

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

From beginning to end, this research project received support and assistance from several individuals. Much credit is due to C. B. Hunt, Jr., Dean of the College of Communications and Fine Arts at Southern Illinois University, who endorsed his commitment to affirmative action with the staff and financial resources necessary to undertake this project.

The Departmental Executive Officers of the academic units within the College of Communications and Fine Arts deserve special recognition for their sustained cooperation and input throughout this project. Our sincere thanks to: Peter Bukalski, Department of Cinema and Photography; Charles Lynch, Department of Radio-TV; Edward McGlone, Department of Speech Communication; John Moncur, Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology; Phillip Olsson, School of Music; Darwin Payne, Department of Theater; Vernon Stone, School of Journalism; and Milton Sullivan, School of Art.

We would like to extend a special thanks to Jeannie Killian whose secretarial skills and graphic wizardry produced the questionnaires and tables included in this study. In addition, Jeannie took charge of those tiresome, but critical tasks involved in survey research such as typing address labels, cover letters and appendices. Above all, we appreciated Jeannie's ability to contribute an appropriate amount of levity in the face of project deadlines. Claudette Simon and Doris Brandon deserve our special gratitude for working within tight time constraints to type various portions of the final draft.

Finally, we must express our gratitude to all of you who took the time to complete and return the questionnaire. Together, we have produced a resource tool for our disciplines.

Mary Lou McCauliff, Ph.D.

Ken E. Askew, Jr.

PREFACE

The purpose of this study was to provide a resource tool for college and university administrators in communications and fine arts who are involved in the formulation, interpretation or execution of affirmative action policy. The data included in this report should be helpful in all phases of any affirmative action effort. The corresponding textual material will suggest possible ways for utilizing the data presented.

The format for this report enables a reader to abstract the material presented for any particular academic unit without reading the entire report. Consequently, those individuals reading the entire report will need to endure some redundancy in the textual description of the data presented.

Finally, your reactions to this report would be valuable. Any comments or inquiries that you would like to make regarding this report should be sent to Mary Lou McCauliff, Dean's Office, College of Communications and Fine Arts, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, 62901.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT		i
PREFACE		iii
CHAPTER		
I	PROBLEM	1
	Introduction	1
	Rationale for the Study	1
	Research Objectives	4
	Background Information on the College of Communications and Fine Arts	5
II	METHOD	6
	Phase I	6
	Phase II	11
III	RESULTS	15
	Phase I	15
	Art	15
	Music	21
	Radio and Television	27
	Theater	34
	Speech Pathology and Audiology	40
	Speech Communication	43
	Cinema	47
	Photography	53
	Journalism	56
	Phase II	60
	Music	60
	Radio and Television	70
	Theater	80
	Speech Pathology and Audiology	90
	Speech Communication	100
	Cinema	109
	Journalism	119
IV	CONCLUSIONS	130
APPENDIX		
A	GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORIES	133
B	COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF PROGRAMS OFFERING DEGREES REQUIRED FOR FACULTY EMPLOYMENT IN THE COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATIONS AND FINE ARTS	137

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX		PAGE
C	PHASE I RESPONSE FORMS	181
D	PHASE I COVER LETTERS	243
E	PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP DIRECTORIES	247
F	PHASE II QUESTIONNAIRE	249
G	PHASE II COVER LETTERS	253

Chapter I

Problem

Introduction

On September 15, 1978, Southern Illinois University entered a conciliation agreement with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in which the University agreed to "intensify affirmative action efforts with regard to recruiting and hiring minorities and women." The implementation of this agreement required more than the pledge of "good intentions" by academic Deans and Departmental Executive Officers. Faculty utilization statistics and goals for hiring females and minorities had to be generated for each academic unit. In addition, each academic unit had to devise procedures for locating and informing qualified females and minorities.

Rationale for the Study

Before goals for hiring females and minorities could be established, some assessment had to be made of the number of "available" females and minorities for faculty positions in each academic unit. Such data is scarce and difficult to apply to the organizational structure of academic units found at all colleges and universities. The most frequently used source of availability data comes from research conducted at the University of Colorado (Corbitt, 1978). Using the Directory of Institutions of Higher Education, the Colorado Study was designed to survey graduate schools across the nation in order to assess the percentage of "available" females and minorities qualified for faculty appointments in each discipline.

Unfortunately, the methodology used in the Colorado Study poses some limitations which make it an inadequate data base for the academic units within the College of Communications and Fine Arts at Southern Illinois University. First, the Colorado Study was designed to collect information from deans of graduate schools and not from directors of graduate programs offered within each academic unit. As a result, the academic categories for which availability data were generated in the Colorado Study are too broad and general to be applicable to the specific academic units within the College of Communications and Fine Arts. For example, the Colorado Study offers availability data for the field of "communications." This category would appear to be an appropriate data base for the Department of Speech Communication at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. However, a closer look at the "communications" category in the Colorado Study reveals that this genre includes the disciplines of advertising, journalism, media and radio-tv. Similarly, there is a category labeled "fine arts" in the Colorado Study. Yet, this category includes only art history and criticism. Therefore, the "fine arts" category does not provide an accurate data base for the School of Art at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The categories for which availability data were generated are not applicable to the academic units within the College of Communications and Fine Arts. This limitation was recognized by the author of the Colorado Study when she indicated that the purpose was to be a "catalyst for this type of data collection" which should be provided through surveys conducted within each discipline (p. 6).

Second, the methodology used in the Colorado Study assessed the percentage of "available" females and minorities holding masters and doctorate degrees. No distinction was made between the MA degree and other masters which are considered to be terminal degrees in some disciplines. For example, the MFA is considered to be an appropriate terminal degree for some faculty positions in the School of Art, the Department of Cinema and Photography, and the Department of Theater. The MM is accepted as an appropriate terminal degree for some positions in the School of Music. Consequently, accurate "availability" data for academic units within the College of Communications and Fine Arts must reflect distinctions among the various masters degrees.

Third, the Colorado Study was designed only to obtain information regarding past degree recipients and did not account for current enrollment statistics or future degree recipients. It is possible that conscientious efforts are being made to recruit more females and minorities for graduate programs. Should this be true, the number of "available" females and minorities will increase in future years. Or, it is possible that a significant percentage of women are leaving the traditionally female-dominated disciplines such as music or speech pathology to pursue careers in what were once male-dominated disciplines such as medicine or law. Should this be true, the number of "available" females in music or speech pathology would decrease in future years. Such trends are not accounted for when relying on records of past degree recipients to predict future availability data.

Research Objectives

In an effort to acquire an accurate data base from which to intensify the effort made by the College of Communications and Fine Arts, the Dean of the College allocated the necessary resources to conduct this study. The research was conducted in two phases. Phase I was designed to acquire availability data to be used in generating affirmative action goals for the eight academic units within the College and for similar academic units at other colleges and universities. Unlike the methodology employed in the Colorado Study, this research was designed to account for the separate curricular divisions within the broad field of communications and fine arts. The research objective for Phase I was to obtain accurate availability data which would reflect the percentage of females and minorities available for employment within each academic unit of the College of Communications and Fine Arts.

Phase II was designed to determine what percentage of those females and minorities identified in Phase I were "recruitable." Knowing the number of females and minorities holding the appropriate degree requisite for employment does not guarantee success in hiring females and minorities. The combination of an inflationary economy and reduced spending at institutions of higher education may cause qualified faculty to be less mobile. If so, utilization goals should not be based solely on the total number of females and minorities holding requisite degrees. Phase II was designed to determine how mobile the "available" females and minorities were and to ascertain what factors (e.g., moving expenses, rank, tenure, or research facilities) were critical in recruiting females and minorities.

Background Information on the College of Communications and Fine Arts

The College of Communications and Fine Arts at Southern Illinois University is comprised of eight academic units: School of Art, Department of Cinema and Photography, School of Journalism, School of Music, Department of Radio-Television, Department of Speech Communication, Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology, and Department of Theater. Each academic unit is chaired by a Departmental Executive Officer (DEO) who reports directly to the Dean of the College. On all issues relating to academic affairs, the Dean of the College reports directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Director of Affirmative Action at Southern Illinois University reports to the President and serves in an advisory role to the Vice President for Academic Affairs on issues and procedures requisite to the hiring of faculty.

Chapter II

Method

This research was conducted in two phases. In Phase I, the academic units of all higher education institutions offering graduate degrees requisite for faculty employment in the College of Communications and Fine Arts were surveyed to determine the proportion of females and racial minority group members in the faculty work force theoretically "available" for employment in the College. In Phase II, members of the major professional organizations associated with the faculty of the academic units of the College were surveyed to determine the self-reported "mobility" of individuals theoretically "available" for College of Communications and Fine Arts faculty positions.

Phase I

Subjects

In Phase I, the College was treated as if it were nine separate academic units. Seven of the academic units within the College were judged to be appropriate academic unit divisions for this research project. However, the Department of Cinema and Photography was split into two academic units because of the different qualifications needed for faculty employed for the cinema program and faculty employed for the photography program.

Appropriate graduate program directories (Appendix A) were used to compile a comprehensive list of programs offering the requisite degrees (Appendix B). A total of 652 chief administrators (i.e., chairpersons,

directors, etc.) representing the academic units identified in Appendix B were respondents for Phase I. Respondents were selected as the individuals most likely to have access to the requested information in each of the academic units offering graduate degrees required for faculty employment in the College. Table 1 shows the unit breakdown of the College, the number of programs surveyed for each academic unit and the response rate for each unit.

Response Forms

A response form (Appendix C) was designed to allow the respondent to identify the graduate degree held, the period in which the degree was received (i.e., 1969-1973 or 1974-1979), the major area of study, the sex and the race of: 1) each individual who had received one of the requisite degrees within the past 10 years; 2) each individual currently enrolled in the respondent's graduate degree program; and 3) each individual expected to complete the graduate degree within the next two years. The response form was designed to permit the respondent to distinguish those individuals whose sex, race, or major area were unknown or indeterminable from available records. In addition to this demographic information, the response form contained questions about the respondent's affirmative action program and the difficulty of the response form. Respondents were asked to specify any existing affirmative action goals for recruiting faculty and graduate students.

Table 2 shows the graduate degrees of interest to each of the College's academic units. Please note that these degrees are generally required for employment. In any specific situation, however, the degree requirement may be waived in favor of equivalent qualifications.

Table 1

Number of Graduate Programs Surveyed in each Academic Unit of Phase I

Academic Unit	Units Surveyed	Unit Responses	Completed Responses
Art	163	70(42.94%)	67(41.10%)
Music	141	51(36.17%)	31(21.99%)
Radio and Television	98	34(34.69%)	23(23.47%)
Theater	77	21(27.27%)	18(23.38%)
Speech Pathology and Audiology	57	21(36.84%)	18(31.58%)
Speech Communication	43	21(48.84%)	18(41.86%)
Cinema	28	8(28.57%)	4(14.29%)
Photography	23	5(21.74%)	5(21.74%)
Journalism	22	16(72.73%)	15(68.18%)
TOTALS	652	247(37.88%)	199(30.52%)

Table 2

Graduate Degrees Required for Faculty Employment

in each CCFA Academic Unit

Academic Unit	Graduate Degrees
Art	Terminal Masters (MFA) Doctorate
Music	Terminal Masters (MM) Doctorate
Radio and Television	Masters (MA, MFA) Doctorate
Theater	Terminal Masters (MFA) Doctorate
Speech Pathology and Audiology	Doctorate
Speech Communication	Doctorate
Cinema	Terminal Masters (MFA) Doctorate
Photography	Terminal Masters (MFA) Doctorate
Journalism	Doctorate

A separate response form was designed for each of the nine academic units in Phase I. (Appendix C) The curricular divisions used within each academic unit to indicate a degree recipient's major area of study within a discipline represent a "reasonable" compromise between the curricula specific to the College's academic units and the typical curricula of the academic units being surveyed. The College's Departmental Executive Officers were consulted for suggestions of common curricular divisions.

Because information was being sought simultaneously on five variables (degree, period received, major area, sex, and race), each response form was sub-divided into a set of tables. Each table requested information on sex, race and major area. Separate tables were provided for each combination of degree and period in which degree was received (e.g., MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973).

Survey Procedure

Lists of the academic units in Appendix B were sent to the College Departmental Executive Officers for their perusal. Requested inclusions or exclusions were made and addresses were obtained for each academic program listed in Appendix B.

A response form, accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix D) and postage-paid return envelope, was mailed to the chief administrator of each graduate program listed in Appendix B. In order to identify non-respondents, response forms were coded with the lists in Appendix B by numbering them in order of appearance on the lists. As response forms were returned, the number on the form was matched to the appropriate list in Appendix B.

Two months after the initial mailing, a follow-up letter (Appendix D), accompanied by a coded response form and postage-paid return envelope, was mailed to each of the non-respondents. In addition to the information requested in the initial mailing, the follow-up letter requested that those recipients unable to complete the form respond by noting why the information was unavailable.

Analysis

As response forms were returned, the raw data provided were tabulated to provide cumulative responses for each of the nine academic units. The cumulative data were then transformed into percentages for use in the results.

Phase II

Subjects

The membership of the major professional organizations associated with the faculty of each academic unit within the College served as the population for Phase II. Organizations from only seven of the nine academic units identified in Phase I were included in Phase II. The organizations associated with the remaining two academic units (Art and Photography) were excluded from Phase II because they do not distribute membership directories. Recommendations of the Departmental Executive Officer of each academic unit in the College were used to select the appropriate organizations. It was not assumed that any of the professional organizations represented a comprehensive picture of the actual pool of qualified individuals theoretically "available" for faculty positions in the College. It was assumed, however, that each

of the organizations represented the most accessible group of readily identified and qualified professionals. Furthermore, since these are the organizations most likely to offer placement services and to receive and distribute employment announcements for graduates in each area, the professional organizations selected were appropriate for this research. Table 3 identifies the professional organization selected for each academic unit included in Phase II.

A random sample of 125 subjects was selected from the membership directory (Appendix E) of each organization listed in Table 3. A total of 875 subjects were initially selected. Subjects who could not be reached through the mail because of incorrect address information were dropped without replacement from the respective samples. Table 3 shows the final sample statistics for each of the seven academic units.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire was constructed that requested respondents to provide demographic information regarding their sex, race, marital status, degree and year received, specialty or major area of interest, employer, academic rank, and tenure status as well as self-reported assessment of their availability and mobility. A copy of the 13-item questionnaire constructed for Phase II can be found in Appendix F. The same questionnaire was used for all academic units.

Survey Procedure

A questionnaire, accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix G) and postage-paid return envelope, was mailed to each of the subjects. In order to identify the appropriate academic unit, each questionnaire

Table 3

Sample Statistics for each of the Academic Units in Phase II

Academic Unit	Professional Organization	Surveys Mailed	Surveys Returned	Return Rate
Music	College Music Society	116	59	50.86%
Radio and Television	National Association of Educational Broadcasters	120	77	64.17%
Theater	American College Theater Association	121	78	64.46%
Speech Pathology and Audiology	American Speech and Hearing Association	106	58	55.66%
Speech Communication	Speech Communication Association	121	70	57.85%
Cinema	University Film Association	124	88	70.97%
Journalism	Association for Educational Journalism	98	69	70.41%
TOTALS		806	500	62.04%

was coded with the initials of the organization from which the subject was selected. A total of 875 questionnaires were mailed.

Three weeks later, a follow-up letter (Appendix G), accompanied by a questionnaire and postage-paid return envelope, was mailed to each of the subjects in Phase II.

Analysis

As questionnaires were returned, the raw data were tabulated to provide cumulative responses to each of the items on the questionnaire. The cumulative data were then converted to percentages for use in the results.

Chapter III

Results

Phase I

Phase I was designed to acquire availability data to be used in generating affirmative action goals for each academic unit within the College of Communications and Fine Arts and for similar academic units at other colleges and universities. Since this research was designed to account for the separate curricular divisions within the broad field of communications and fine arts, a separate data analysis was conducted for each of the nine curricular divisions included in this research.

Art

The response form constructed for art (Appendix C) was mailed to the Directors of 163 programs offering graduate degrees in art (Appendix B). The first mailing of the response form resulted in a response from 43 Directors. However, after the second mailing, response forms were received from an additional 27 Directors. While some of the Directors responded to say that the requested information was unavailable, 67 of the 70 response forms returned contained the requested information and could be used in tabulating the results. This represented a return rate of 41.1 percent for art.

Tables 4 through 11 report data which is pertinent to generating affirmative action goals in art. Tables 4 and 5 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned the MFA degree during the past ten years. Because data was reported in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979, it is possible to note changes in the number of

Table 4

Art MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	1005(42%)	63(3%)	243(10%)	1311(55%)
Female	557(23%)	28(1%)	132(6%)	717(30%)
Unknown	64(3%)	0	305(12%)	369(15%)
Column Totals	1626(68%)	91(4%)	680(28%)	2397(100%)

Table 5

Art MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	1295(36%)	160(4%)	513(14%)	1968(54%)
Female	1012(28%)	56(2%)	353(10%)	1421(40%)
Unknown	84(2%)	2(0%)	130(4%)	216(6%)
Column Totals	2391(66%)	218(6%)	996(28%)	3605(100%)

Table 6

Art Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	88(57%)	6(4%)	0	94(61%)
Female	59(38%)	1(1%)	0	60(39%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	147(95%)	7(5%)	0	154(100%)

Table 7

Art Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	96(42%)	2(1%)	0	98(43%)
Female	126(55%)	4(2%)	0	130(57%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	222(97%)	6(3%)	0	228(100%)

Table 8

Art MFA Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	905(42%)	60(3%)	93(4%)	1058(49%)
Female	933(43%)	51(2%)	115(6%)	1099(51%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	1838(85%)	111(5%)	208(10%)	2157(100%)

Table 9

Art Doctorate Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	191(50%)	5(1%)	0	196(51%)
Female	179(47%)	9(2%)	0	188(49%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	370(97%)	14(3%)	0	384(100%)

Table 10

Expected MFA Degree Recipients in Art

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	688(48%)	61(4%)	13(1%)	742(51%)
Female	644(45%)	41(3%)	17(1%)	702(49%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	1312(91%)	102(7%)	30(2%)	1444(100%)

Table 11

Expected Doctorate Degree Recipients in Art

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	66(36%)	4(2%)	0	70(38%)
Female	108(60%)	4(2%)	0	112(62%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	174(96%)	8(4%)	0	182(100%)

females and minorities earning the MFA degree in art. The period from 1974-1979 shows an increase from the 1969-1973 period in the percent of both females and minorities earning the MFA degree in art. This information can be helpful in trying to determine the "availability" of females and minorities at junior and senior ranks. For example, it would be more accurate to base a utilization goal for hiring a female for a senior faculty position on the data base provided for the period 1969-1973 because it is unlikely that any individual earning the MFA degree within the last five years would have the amount of experience or publication requisite for the rank of full professor.

Tables 6 and 7 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned doctorate degrees in art during the past ten years. Again, the data is presented in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979. The data presented on Tables 6 and 7 indicate that the period from 1974-1979 marked an increase in the percent of females earning the doctorate degree in art, but a decrease in the percent of minorities earning the doctorate degree in art. This finding suggests that the "availability" of minorities may be slightly greater for senior faculty positions than for junior faculty positions.

Tables 8 and 9 report the number and percent of females and minorities who are currently enrolled in graduate degree programs. Tables 10 and 11 report the number and percent of females and minorities expected to complete MFA or doctorate degrees during the next two years. By comparing Tables 8 and 10 for the MFA degree and Tables 9 and 11 for the doctorate degree, it is possible to determine differences in the number of females and minorities currently enrolled in these degree

programs and the number expected to finish during the next two years. These differences could be an indication of such factors as a drop-out rate among females and minorities or changes in the recruitment of females and minorities for graduate programs. The data presented on Tables 8 and 10 suggest that, for the MFA degree in art, there will be an increase in the percent of minorities, but a decrease in the percent of females expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled in MFA programs. The data presented on Tables 9 and 11 suggest that, for the doctorate degree in art, there will be an increase in the percent of both females and minorities expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled.

Music

The response form constructed for music (Appendix C) was mailed to the Directors of 141 programs offering graduate degrees in music (Appendix B). The first mailing of the response form resulted in a response from 25 Directors. However, after the second mailing, response forms were received from an additional 26 Directors. While some of the Directors responded to say that the requested information was unavailable, 31 of the 51 response forms returned contained the requested information and could be used in tabulating the results. This represented a return rate of 21.99 percent for music.

Tables 12 through 19 report data which is pertinent to generating affirmative action goals in music. Tables 12 and 13 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned the MFA, the MM,

Table 12

Music MFA, MM, & MME Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	569(42%)	37(3%)	104(8%)	710(53%)
Female	461(35%)	34(2%)	108(8%)	603(45%)
Unknown	0	0	24(2%)	24(2%)
Column Totals	1030(77%)	71(5%)	236(18%)	1337(100%)

Table 13

Music MFA, MM, & MME Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	777(45%)	65(4%)	69(4%)	911(53%)
Female	681(40%)	62(4%)	29(2%)	772(46%)
Unknown	0	0	27(1%)	27(1%)
Column Totals	1458(85%)	127(8%)	125(7%)	1710(100%)

Table 14

Music Doctorate Degree Recipients—Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	164(85%)	3(2%)	0	167(87%)
Female	23(13%)	1(0%)	1(0%)	25(13%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	187(98%)	4(2%)	1(0%)	192(100%)

Table 15

Music Doctorate Degree Recipients—Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	156(75%)	6(3%)	0	162(78%)
Female	42(20%)	5(2%)	0	47(22%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	198(95%)	11(5%)	0	209(100%)

Table 16

Music, MFA, MM, & MME Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	577(51%)	45(4%)	7(1%)	629(56%)
Female	442(39%)	49(4%)	10(1%)	501(44%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	1019(90%)	94(8%)	17(2%)	1030(100%)

Table 17

Music Doctorate Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	214(66%)	7(2%)	0	221(68%)
Female	98(30%)	7(2%)	0	105(32%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	312(96%)	14(4%)	0	326(100%)

Table 18

Expected MFA, MM, & MME Degree Recipients in Music

Sex	Race: Majority	Race: Minority	Race: Unknown	Row Totals
Male	346(48%)	23(3%)	21(3%)	390(54%)
Female	304(43%)	22(3%)	0	326(46%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	650(91%)	45(6%)	21(3%)	716(100%)

Table 19

Expected Doctorate Degree Recipients in Music

Sex	Race: Majority	Race: Minority	Race: Unknown	Row Totals
Male	103(57%)	18(10%)	0	121(67%)
Female	51(28%)	10(5%)	0	61(33%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	154(85%)	28(15%)	0	182(100%)

or the MME degree during the past ten years.[1] Because data was reported in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979, it is possible to note changes in the number of females and minorities earning MFA, MM, or MME degrees in music. The period from 1974-1979 shows an increase from the 1969-1973 period in the percent of both females and minorities earning the MFA, MM, or MME degrees in music. This information can be helpful in trying to determine the "availability" of females or minorities at junior and senior ranks. For example, it would be more accurate to base a utilization goal for hiring a minority for a senior faculty position on the data base provided for the period 1969-1973 because it is unlikely that any individual earning the MFA, MM, or MME degree within the last five years would have the amount of experience or publication requisite for the rank of full professor.

Tables 14 and 15 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned doctorate degrees in music during the past ten years. Again, the data is presented in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979. The data presented on Tables 14 and 15 indicate that the period from 1974-1979 marked an increase in the percent of both females and minorities earning the doctorate degree in music. This finding suggests that the "availability" of females and minorities will be greater for junior faculty positions than for senior faculty positions.

---

[1] The MM is more widely accepted as a terminal degree for some faculty positions in music than the MFA or MME. However, since some colleges and universities accept the MFA and MME as terminal degrees, programs offering these degrees were included in this research.

Tables 16 and 17 report the number and percent of females and minorities who are currently enrolled in graduate degree programs. Tables 18 and 19 report the number and percent of females and minorities expected to complete MFA, MM, MME, or doctorate degrees during the next two years. By comparing Tables 16 and 18 for the MFA, MM, and MME degrees and Tables 17 and 19 for the doctorate degree, it is possible to determine differences in the number of females and minorities currently enrolled in these degree programs and the number expected to finish during the next two years. These differences could be an indication of such factors as a drop-out rate among females and minorities or changes in the recruitment of females and minorities for graduate programs. The data presented on Tables 16 and 18 suggest that, for the MFA, the MM, and the MME degrees, there will be an increase in the percent of females, but a decrease in the percent of minorities expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent of each currently enrolled in MFA, MM, or MME degree programs. The data presented on Tables 17 and 19 suggest that, for the doctorate degree in music, there will be an increase in the percent of both females and minorities expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled.

Radio and Television

The response form constructed for radio and television (Appendix C) was mailed to the Directors of 98 programs offering graduate degrees in radio and television (Appendix B). The first mailing of the response form resulted in a response from 12 Directors. However, after the second mailing, response forms were received from an additional 22 Directors. While some of the Directors responded to say that the requested informa-

tion was unavailable, 23 of the 34 response forms returned contained the requested information and could be used in tabulating the results. This represented a return rate of 23.47 percent for radio and television.

Tables 20 through 27 report data which is pertinent to generating affirmative action goals in radio and television. Tables 20 and 21 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned the masters degree during the past ten years. Because data was reported in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979, it is possible to note changes in the number of females and minorities earning the masters degree in radio and television. The period from 1974-1979 shows an increase from the 1969-1973 period in the percent of both females and minorities earning the masters degree in radio and television. This information can be helpful in trying to determine the "availability" of females and minorities at the junior and senior ranks. For example, it would be more accurate to base a utilization goal for hiring a minority for a senior faculty position on the data base provided for the period 1969-1973 because it is unlikely than any individual earning the masters degree within the last five years would have the amount of experience or publication requisite for the rank of full professor.

Tables 22 and 23 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned doctorate degrees in radio and television during the past ten years. Again, the data is presented in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979. The data presented on Tables 22 and 23 indicate that the period from 1974-1979 marked an increase in the percent of females, but a decrease in the percent of minorities earning the doctorate degree in radio and television. This finding suggests

Table 20

Radio and Television Masters Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	151(36%)	1(0%)	132(31%)	284(67%)
Female	101(24%)	4(1%)	22(5%)	127(30%)
Unknown	1(0%)	0	11(3%)	12(3%)
Column Totals	253(60%)	5(1%)	165(39%)	423(100%)

Table 21

Radio and Television Masters Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	245(44%)	30(5%)	78(14%)	353(63%)
Female	159(28%)	16(3%)	24(4%)	199(35%)
Unknown	9(2%)	1(0%)	0	10(2%)
Column Totals	413(74%)	47(8%)	102(18%)	562(100%)

Table 22

Radio and Television Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	40(73%)	2(3%)	0	42(76%)
Female	12(22%)	1(2%)	0	13(24%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	52(95%)	3(5%)	0	55(100%)

Table 23

Radio and Television Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	57(69%)	2(2%)	0	59(71%)
Female	24(29%)	0	0	24(29%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	81(98%)	2(2%)	0	83(100%)

Table 24

Radio and Television Masters Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	350(45%)	49(6%)	38(5%)	437(56%)
Female	256(33%)	57(8%)	22(3%)	335(44%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	606(78%)	106(14%)	60(8%)	772(100%)

Table 25

Radio and Television Doctorate Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	61(47%)	5(4%)	15(12%)	81(63%)
Female	40(31%)	4(3%)	4(3%)	48(37%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	101(78%)	9(7%)	19(15%)	129(100%)

Table 26

Expected Masters Degree Recipients in Radio and Television

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	176(48%)	30(8%)	0	206(56%)
Female	132(36%)	27(8%)	0	159(44%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	308(84%)	57(16%)	0	365(100%)

Table 27

Expected Doctorate Degree Recipients in Radio and Television

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	37(64%)	3(5%)	0	40(69%)
Female	15(26%)	3(5%)	0	18(31%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	52(90%)	6(10%)	0	58(100%)

that the "availability" of females will be greater for junior faculty positions than for senior faculty positions. However, the "availability" of minorities will be slightly greater for senior faculty positions than for junior faculty positions.

Tables 24 and 25 report the number and percent of females and minorities who are currently enrolled in graduate degree programs. Tables 26 and 27 report the number and percent of females and minorities expected to complete masters or doctorate degrees during the next two years. By comparing Tables 24 and 26 for the masters degree and Tables 25 and 27 for the doctorate degree, it is possible to determine differences in the number of females and minorities currently enrolled in these degree programs and the number expected to finish during the next two years. These differences could be an indication of such factors as a drop-out rate among females and minorities or changes in the recruitment of females and minorities for graduate programs. The data presented on Tables 24 and 26 suggest that, for the masters degree, there will be an increase in the percent of minorities expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled in the masters degree programs. The data presented on Tables 25 and 27 suggest that, for the doctorate degree in radio and television, there will be an increase in the percent of minorities, but a decrease in the percent of females expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled.

Theater

The response form constructed for theater (Appendix C) was mailed to the Directors of 77 programs offering graduate degrees in theater (Appendix B). The first mailing of the response form resulted in a response from 11 Directors. However, after the second mailing, response forms were received from an additional 10 Directors. While some of the Directors responded to say that the requested information was unavailable, 18 of the 21 response forms returned contained the requested information and could be used in tabulating the results. This represented a return rate of 23.38 percent for theater.

Tables 28 through 35 report data which is pertinent to generating affirmative action goals in theater. Tables 28 and 29 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned the MFA degree during the past ten years. Because data was reported in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979, it is possible to note changes in the number of females and minorities earning the MFA degree in theater. The period from 1974-1979 shows a decrease from the 1969-1973 period in the percent of minorities earning the MFA degree in theater. This information can be helpful in trying to determine the "availability" of minorities at junior and senior ranks. For example, it would be more accurate to base a utilization goal for hiring a minority for a junior faculty position on the data base provided for the period 1974-1979 because it is likely that the greater number of minority applicants who earned the MFA in the period 1969-1973 will have the amount of experience and publication requisite for a senior faculty position.

Table 28

Theater MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	99(57%)	11(6%)	0	110(63%)
Female	51(30%)	12(7%)	0	63(37%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	150(87%)	23(13%)	0	173(100%)

Table 29

Theater MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	304(62%)	7(2%)	0	311(64%)
Female	171(35%)	6(1%)	0	177(36%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	475(97%)	13(3%)	0	488(100%)

Table 30

Theater Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	93(81%)	4(3%)	0	97(84%)
Female	17(15%)	1(1%)	0	18(16%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	110(96%)	5(4%)	0	115(100%)

Table 31

Theater Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	99(71%)	10(7%)	0	109(78%)
Female	30(21%)	1(1%)	0	31(22%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	129(92%)	11(8%)	0	140(100%)

Table 32

Theater MFA Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	143(51%)	7(3%)	0	150(54%)
Female	121(43%)	8(3%)	0	129(46%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	264(94%)	15(6%)	0	279(100%)

Table 33

Theater Doctorate Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	123(56%)	9(4%)	0	132(60%)
Female	84(38%)	4(2%)	0	88(40%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	207(94%)	13(6%)	0	220(100%)

Table 34

Expected MFA Degree Recipients in Theater

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	130(54%)	5(2%)	0	135(56%)
Female	97(41%)	7(3%)	0	104(44%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	227(95%)	12(5%)	0	239(100%)

Table 35

Expected Doctorate Degree Recipients in Theater

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	68(62%)	7(6%)	0	75(68%)
Female	33(30%)	2(2%)	0	35(32%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	101(92%)	9(8%)	0	110(100%)

Tables 30 and 31 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned doctorate degrees in theater during the past ten years. Again, the data is presented in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979. The data presented on Tables 30 and 31 indicate that the period from 1974-1979 marked an increase in the percent of both females and minorities earning the doctorate degree in theater. This finding suggests that the "availability" of females and minorities will be greater for junior faculty positions than for senior faculty positions.

Tables 32 and 33 report the number and percent of females and minorities who are currently enrolled in graduate degree programs. Tables 34 and 35 report the number and percent of females and minorities expected to complete the MFA or doctorate degrees during the next two years. By comparing Tables 32 and 34 for the MFA degree and Tables 33 and 35 for the doctorate degree, it is possible to determine differences in the number of females and minorities currently enrolled in these degree programs and the number expected to finish during the next two years. These differences could be an indication of such factors as a drop-out rate among females and minorities or changes in the recruitment of females and minorities for graduate programs. The data presented on Tables 32 and 34 suggest that, for the MFA degree, there will be a decrease in the percent of both females and minorities expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled in MFA degree programs. The data presented on Tables 33 and 35 suggest that, for the doctorate degree in theater, there will be an increase in the percent of minorities, but a decrease in the percent of

females expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled.

Speech Pathology and Audiology

The response form constructed for speech pathology and audiology (Appendix C) was mailed to the Directors of 57 programs offering doctorate degrees in speech pathology and audiology (Appendix B). The first mailing of the response form resulted in a response from 15 Directors. However, after the second mailing, response forms were received from an additional 6 Directors. While some of the Directors responded to say that the requested information was unavailable, 18 of the 21 response forms returned contained the requested information and could be used in tabulating the results. This represented a return rate of 31.58 percent for speech pathology and audiology.

Tables 36 through 39 report data which is pertinent to generating affirmative action goals in speech pathology and audiology. Tables 36 and 37 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned the doctorate degree during the past ten years. Because data was reported in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979, it is possible to note changes in the number of females and minorities earning the doctorate degree in speech pathology and audiology. The period from 1974-1979 shows a decrease from the 1969-1973 period in the percent of both females and minorities earning the doctorate degree in speech pathology and audiology. This information can be helpful in trying to determine the "availability" of females and minorities at junior and senior ranks. For example, it would be more accurate to base a utilization goal for hiring a minority for a junior faculty position on the

Table 36

Speech Pathology and Audiology Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1968-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	163(53%)	4(1%)	0	167(54%)
Female	76(25%)	65(21%)	0	141(46%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	239(78%)	69(22%)	0	308(100%)

Table 37

Speech Pathology and Audiology Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	117(53%)	7(3%)	0	124(56%)
Female	87(40%)	8(4%)	0	95(44%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	204(93%)	15(7%)	0	219(100%)

Table 38

Speech Pathology and Audiology Doctorate Degree Student Enrollment

	Race			
Sex	Majority	Minority	Unknown	Row Totals
Male	82(36%)	11(5%)	0	93(41%)
Female	123(55%)	10(4%)	0	133(59%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	205(91%)	21(9%)	0	226(100%)

Table 39

Expected Doctorate Degree Recipients in Speech Pathology and Audiology

	Race			
Sex	Majority	Minority	Unknown	Row Totals
Male	53(40%)	6(5%)	0	59(45%)
Female	67(52%)	4(3%)	0	71(55%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	120(92%)	10(8%)	0	130(100%)

data base provided for the period 1974-1979 because it is likely that the greater number of minority applicants who earned the doctorate in the period 1969-1973 will have the amount of experience and publication more appropriate for a senior faculty position.

Table 38 reports the number and percent of females and minorities who are currently enrolled in graduate degree programs. Table 39 reports the number and percent of females and minorities expected to complete the doctorate degree during the next two years. By comparing Tables 38 and 39, it is possible to determine differences in the number of females and minorities currently enrolled in doctoral programs and the number expected to finish during the next two years. These differences could be an indication of such factors as a drop-out rate among females and minorities or changes in the recruitment of females and minorities for graduate programs. The data presented on Tables 38 and 39 suggest that there will be a decrease in the percent of females and minorities expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled in graduate programs.

Speech Communication

The response form constructed for speech communication (Appendix C) was mailed to the Directors of 43 programs offering doctorate degrees in speech communication (Appendix B). The first mailing of the response form resulted in a response from 14 Directors. However, after the second mailing, response forms were received from an additional 7 Directors. While some of the Directors responded to say that the requested information was unavailable, 18 of the 21 response forms returned contained

the requested information and could be used in tabulating the results. This represented a return rate of 41.86 percent for speech communication.

Tables 40 through 43 report data which is pertinent to generating affirmative action goals in speech communication. Tables 40 and 41 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned the doctorate degree during the past ten years. Because data was reported in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979, it is possible to note changes in the number of females and minorities earning the doctorate degree in speech communication. The period from 1974-1979 shows an increase from the 1969-1973 period in the percent of both females and minorities earning the doctorate degree in speech communication. This information can be helpful in trying to determine the "availability" of females and minorities at junior and senior ranks. For example, it would be more accurate to base a utilization goal for hiring a minority for a senior faculty position on the data base provided for the period 1969-1973 because it is unlikely that any individual earning the doctorate degree within the last five years would have the amount of experience and publication requisite for the rank of full professor.

Table 42 reports the number and percent of females and minorities who are currently enrolled in graduate degree programs. Table 43 reports the number and percent of females and minorities expected to complete the doctorate degree during the next two years. By comparing Tables 42 and 43, it is possible to determine differences in the number of females and minorities currently enrolled in doctoral programs and the number expected to finish during the next two years. These differences

Table 40

Speech Communication Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	315(70%)	18(4%)	0	333(74%)
Female	100(23%)	15(3%)	0	115(26%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	415(93%)	33(7%)	0	448(100%)

Table 41

Speech Communication Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	289(60%)	20(4%)	0	309(64%)
Female	144(30%)	31(6%)	0	175(36%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	433(90%)	51(10%)	0	484(100%)

Table 42

Speech Communication Doctorate Degree Student Enrollment

	Race			
Sex	Majority	Minority	Unknown	Row Totals
Male	316(52%)	28(4%)	0	344(56%)
Female	226(37%)	42(7%)	0	268(44%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	542(89%)	70(11%)	0	612(100%)

Table 43

Expected Doctorate Degree Recipients in Speech Communication

	Race			
Sex	Majority	Minority	Unknown	Row Totals
Male	179(49%)	20(6%)	1(0%)	200(55%)
Female	132(37%)	29(8%)	0	161(45%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	311(86%)	49(14%)	1(0%)	361(100%)

could be an indication of such factors as a drop-out rate among females and minorities or changes in the recruitment of females and minorities for graduate programs. The data presented on Tables 42 and 43 suggest that there will be an increase in the percent of both females and minorities expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled in graduate programs.

Cinema

The response form constructed for cinema (Appendix C) was mailed to the Directors of 28 programs offering graduate degrees in cinema (Appendix B). The first mailing of the response form resulted in no response. However, after the second mailing, response forms were received from 8 Directors. While some of the Directors responded to say that the requested information was unavailable, 4 of the 8 response forms returned contained the requested information and could be used in tabulating the results. This represented a return rate of 14.29 percent in cinema.

Tables 44 through 51 report data which is pertinent to generating affirmative action goals in cinema. Tables 44 and 45 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned the MFA degree during the past ten years. Because data was reported for only one of the two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979, it is possible to determine that records of the sex or race of MFA degree recipients in cinema are only available for the last five years. This information can be helpful in trying to determine the "availability" of females and minorities at junior and senior ranks. For example, it would be inappropriate to base a utilization goal for hiring a female or minority

Table 44

Cinema MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	6			
Female				
Unknown				
Column Totals				

Table 45

Cinema MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	18(72%)	1(4%)	0	19(76%)
Female	6(24%)	0	0	6(24%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	24(96%)	1(4%)	0	25(100%)

Table 46

Cinema Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race: Majority	Race: Minority	Race: Unknown	Row Totals
Male	8			
Female				
Unknown				
Column Totals				

Table 47

Cinema Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race: Majority	Race: Minority	Race: Unknown	Row Totals
Male	16(80%)	0	0	16(80%)
Female	4(20%)	0	0	4(20%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	20(100%)	0	0	20(100%)

Table 48

Cinema MFA Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	23(66%)	1(3%)	1(3%)	25(72%)
Female	10(28%)	0	0	10(28%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	33(94%)	1(3%)	1(3%)	35(100%)

Table 49

Cinema Doctorate Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	14(52%)	0	0	14(52%)
Female	12(44%)	1(4%)	0	13(48%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	26(96%)	1(4%)	0	27(100%)

Table 50

Expected MFA Degree Recipients in Cinema

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	10(48%)	2(9%)	3(14%)	15(71%)
Female	5(24%)	0	1(5%)	6(29%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	15(72%)	2(9%)	4(19%)	21(100%)

Table 51

Expected Doctorate Degree Recipients in Cinema

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	6(38%)	0	0	6(38%)
Female	9(56%)	1(6%)	0	10(62%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	15(94%)	1(6%)	0	16(100%)

for a senior faculty position on the data base provided for the period 1974-1979 because it is unlikely that any individual earning the MFA degree within the past five years would have the amount of experience and publication requisite for the rank of full professor.

Tables 46 and 47 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned doctorate degrees in cinema during the past ten years. Again, the data is reported in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979, which reveals the lack of records on doctorate degree recipients during the period 1969-1973.

Tables 48 and 49 report the number and percent of females and minorities who are currently enrolled in graduate degree programs. Tables 50 and 51 report the number and percent of females and minorities expected to complete MFA or doctorate degrees during the next two years. By comparing Tables 48 and 50 for the MFA degree and Tables 49 and 51 for the doctorate degree, it is possible to determine differences in the number of females and minorities currently enrolled in these degree programs and the number expected to finish during the next two years. These differences could be an indication of such factors as a drop-out rate among females and minorities or changes in the recruitment of females and minorities for graduate programs. The data presented on Tables 48 and 50 suggest that, for the MFA degree, there will be an increase in the percent of both females and minorities expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled in MFA degree programs. The data presented on Tables 49 and 51 suggest that, for the doctorate degree, there will be an increase in the percent of both females and minorities expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled.

Photography

The response form constructed for photography (Appendix C) was mailed to the Directors of 23 programs offering graduate degrees in photography (Appendix B). The first mailing of the response form resulted in a response from 5 Directors. After the second mailing, no response forms were received. All of the response forms returned contained the requested information and could be used in tabulating the results. This represented a return rate of 21.74 percent for photography.

Tables 52 through 55 report data which is pertinent to generating affirmative action goals in photography. Tables 52 and 53 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned the MFA degree during the past ten years. Because data was reported in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979, it is possible to note changes in the number of females and minorities earning the MFA degree in photography. The period from 1974-1979 shows an increase from the 1969-1973 period in the percent of minorities earning the MFA degree in photography. At the same time, the period from 1974-1979 shows a slight decrease from the 1969-1973 period in the percent of females earning the MFA degree in photography. This information can be helpful in trying to determine the "availability" of females and minorities for junior and senior ranks. For example, it would be more accurate to base a utilization goal for hiring a minority for a senior faculty position on the data base provided for the period 1969-1973 because it is unlikely that any individual earning the MFA degree within the last five years would have the amount of experience and publication requisite for the rank of full professor.

Table 52

Photography MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	59(58%)	3(3%)	2(2%)	64(63%)
Female	35(34%)	2(2%)	1(1%)	38(37%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	94(92%)	5(5%)	3(3%)	102(100%)

Table 53

Photography MFA Degree Recipients—Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	96(57%)	8(5%)	5(3%)	109(65%)
Female	49(29%)	6(3%)	5(3%)	60(35%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	145(86%)	14(8%)	10(6%)	169(100%)

Table 54

Photography MFA Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race: Majority	Race: Minority	Race: Unknown	Row Totals
Male	24(65%)	1(3%)	0	25(68%)
Female	12(32%)	0	0	12(32%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	36(97%)	1(3%)	0	37(100%)

Table 55

Expected MFA Degree Recipients in Photography

Sex	Race: Majority	Race: Minority	Race: Unknown	Row Totals
Male	8(62%)	1(8%)	2(15%)	11(85%)
Female	2(15%)	0	0	2(15%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	10(77%)	1(8%)	2(15%)	13(100%)

Table 54 reports the number and percent of females and minorities who are currently enrolled in graduate degree programs. Table 55 reports the number and percent of females and minorities expected to complete the MFA degree during the next two years. By comparing Tables 54 and 55, it is possible to determine differences in the number of females and minorities currently enrolled in graduate degree programs and the number expected to finish during the next two years. These differences could be an indication of such factors as a drop-out rate among females and minorities or changes in the recruitment of females and minorities for graduate programs. The data presented on Tables 54 and 55 suggest that there will be an increase in the percent of minorities, but a decrease in the percent of females expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled in MFA degree programs.

Journalism

The response form constructed for journalism (Appendix C) was mailed to the Directors of 22 programs offering doctorate degrees in journalism (Appendix B). The first mailing of the response form resulted in a response from 10 Directors. However, after the second mailing, response forms were received from an additional 6 Directors. While one of the Directors responded to say that the requested information was unavailable, 15 of the 16 response forms returned contained the requested information and could be used in tabulating the results. This represented a return rate of 68.18 percent for journalism.

Tables 56 through 59 report data which is pertinent to generating affirmative action goals in journalism. Tables 56 and 57 report the number and percent of females and minorities who have earned the doctorate degree during the past ten years. Because data was reported in two five-year periods, 1969-1973 and 1974-1979, it is possible to note changes in the number of females and minorities earning the doctorate degree in journalism. The period from 1974-1979 shows an increase from the 1969-1973 period in the percent of females earning the doctorate degree in journalism. This information can be helpful in trying to determine the "availability" of females and minorities at junior and senior ranks. For example, it would be more accurate to base a utilization goal for hiring a minority for a senior faculty position on the data base provided for the period 1969-1973 because it is unlikely that any individual earning the doctorate degree within the last five years would have the amount of experience and publication requisite for the rank of full professor.

Table 58 reports the number and percent of females and minorities who are currently enrolled in graduate degree programs. Table 59 reports the number and percent of females and minorities expected to complete the doctorate degree within the next two years. By comparing Tables 58 and 59, it is possible to determine differences in the number of females and minorities currently enrolled in doctoral programs and the number expected to finish during the next two years. These differences could be an indication of such factors as a drop-out rate among females and minorities or changes in the recruitment of females and minorities for graduate programs. The data presented on Tables 58 and

Table 56

Journalism Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	124(76%)	17(11%)	2(1%)	143(88%)
Female	16(10%)	2(1%)	1(1%)	19(12%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	140(86%)	19(12%)	3(2%)	162(100%)

Table 57

Journalism Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	174(68%)	28(11%)	3(1%)	205(80%)
Female	45(18%)	1(1%)	3(1%)	49(20%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	219(86%)	29(12%)	6(2%)	254(100%)

Table 58

Journalism Doctorate Degree Student Enrollment

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	157(54%)	30(10%)	8(3%)	195(67%)
Female	79(28%)	11(4%)	4(1%)	94(33%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	236(82%)	41(14%)	12(4%)	289(100%)

Table 59

Expected Doctorate Degree Recipients in Journalism

Sex	Race			Row Totals
	Majority	Minority	Unknown	
Male	76(54%)	10(7%)	3(2%)	89(63%)
Female	46(33%)	5(3%)	2(1%)	53(37%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Column Totals	122(87%)	15(10%)	5(3%)	142(100%)

59 suggest that there will be an increase in the percent of females, but a decrease in the percent of minorities expected to graduate during the next two years over the percent currently enrolled in graduate programs.

Phase II

Phase II was designed to determine what percentage of those females and minorities identified in Phase I were "recruitable." Simply knowing the number of females and minorities holding the appropriate degree requisite for employment does not guarantee success in hiring females and minorities. Phase II was designed to determine how mobile the "available" females and minorities were and to ascertain what factors, e.g., moving expenses, academic rank, tenure or salary, would be necessary to recruit females and minorities. Since those factors which may affect the mobility of females and minorities may vary with each discipline, a separate analysis was conducted for each of the seven curricular divisions included in this research.

Music

The questionnaire constructed for Phase II (Appendix F) was mailed to 116 professionals who had been selected at random from the membership directory of the College Music Society. The first mailing of the questionnaire resulted in a response from 30 people. A second mailing of the questionnaire resulted in an additional 29 responses. This represented a return rate of 50.86 percent for music.

An analysis of the demographic information requested on the questionnaire provided a description of the population surveyed for music in Phase II. Of the 59 respondents, 41 were male and 18 were

female. Thirty-four of the 41 male respondents and 11 of the 18 female respondents were married. None of the respondents identified themselves as a member of a racial minority. As a result, the data analysis conducted for music only reflects a comparison between female and male mobility. The analysis of the demographic data also revealed that of the 59 respondents, 95 percent taught at a four-year college or university and 83 percent were tenured. Information regarding the academic rank of the respondents varied with each sex. Of the 41 male respondents, 41 percent held the rank of full professor and 32 percent held the rank of associate professor. Of the 18 female respondents, 33 percent held the rank of assistant professor, 28 percent held the rank of associate professor and only 28 percent held the rank of full professor.

Tables 60 through 65 report data which is pertinent to determining the "recruitability" of available faculty in music. Three items of information were obtained on the questionnaire: the respondents' assessment of their mobility, the respondents' distance preference for relocation, and the respondents' definition of "better" job characteristics. Respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood that they would relocate during the next few years. Forty-seven of the 59 respondents were able to assess their mobility and, therefore, could be used as respondents for the data presented in Tables 60 through 63. Responses obtained on the mobility item were analyzed in terms of tenure status and academic rank. Table 60 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 61 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with tenure status. A comparison of the data presented in the two tables reveals that 77 percent of the tenured females and 86 per-

Table 60

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--CMS

Female

Mobility	Tenured(n=13)	Not Tenured(n= 2)
VM	3 (23%)	2 (100%)
NM	10 (77%)	0
	100%	100%

Single Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 5)	Not Tenured(n= 1)
VM	1 (20%)	1 (100%)
NM	4 (80%)	0
	100%	100%

Married Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 8)	Not Tenured(n= 1)
VM	2 (25%)	1 (100%)
NM	6 (75%)	0
	100%	100%

Table 61

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--CMS

Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=28)	Not Tenured(n= 4)
VM	4 (14%)	3 (75%)
NM	24 (86%)	1 (25%)
	100%	100%

Single Male

Mobil ty	Tenured(n= 3)	Not Tenured(n=4)
VM	0	3 (75%)
NM	3 (100%)	1 (25%)
	100%	100%

Married Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=25)	Not Tenured(n= 0)
VM	4 (16%)	0
NM	21 (84%)	0
	100%	0

Table 62

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--CMS

Female
(n=15)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	13.5%	20%	0	0	0	0
NM	0	0	13.5%	26.5%	26.5%	0	0

Single Female
(n=6)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	33.5%	0	0	0	0
NM	0	0	0	50%	16.5%	0	0

Married Female
(n= 9)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	22.5%	11%	0	0	0	0
NM	0	0	22.5%	11%	33%	0	0

Table 63

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--CMS

Male
(n=32)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	3%	3%	9.5%	6.5%	0	0
NM	0	0	12.5%	19%	43.5%	3%	0

Single Male
(n=7)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	14.5%	14.5%	14.5%	0	0	0
NM	0	0	14.5%	14.5%	27.5%	0	0

Married Male
(n=25)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	0	8%	8%	0	0
NM	0	0	12%	20%	48%	4%	0

Table 64

Subjects Indication of Distance Preference in Relocation--CMS

	Female (n=18)			Male (n=39)		
Distance	Single (n= 7)	Married (n=11)	Total Female	Single (n= 7)	Married (n=32)	Total Male
Short (0-50 mi.)	0	36.5%	22%	0	15.5%	13%
Long (no limit)	100%	63.5%	78%	100%	84.5%	87%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 65

Characteristics of a "Better" Job - CMS

Female (n=18)		Male (n=41)	
Salary	56%	Salary	68%
Rank	56%	Geography	49%
Geography	33%	Rank	29%
Course Load	17%	Course Load	24%
Performance Opportunity	11%	Student Quality	15%
Creative Flexibility	11%	Course Assignment	12%
Dept. Reputation	11%	Dept. Administration	12%
Challenge	11%	Dept. Reputation	10%
Community Environment	11%		

cent of the tenured males rated themselves as "not mobile." In addition, 80 percent of the single tenured females and 100 percent of the single tenured males rated themselves as "not mobile." Similarly, 75 percent of the married tenured females and 84 percent of the married tenured males rated themselves "not mobile." This finding suggests that tenure tends to decrease the mobility of male faculty more than female faculty.

Table 62 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 63 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with academic rank. A comparison of the data presented on the two tables indicates some differences in the mobility of each group. Females at the ranks of instructor and assistant professor were mobile, but females at the ranks of associate professor and full professor were not mobile. However, a percentage of males at all ranks were mobile. The same trend appeared when this data was further analyzed in terms of marital status. A percentage of males at the higher ranks, regardless of marital status, rated themselves as more mobile than the female respondents. Both single and married females at the higher ranks were not willing to relocate. This finding suggests that, for females, there is an inverse relationship between academic rank and mobility. Females in music are less mobile at higher academic ranks than at lower ranks. This relationship is not apparent in the data on males in music. On a pragmatic level, the data implies that it will be difficult to recruit qualified females for senior faculty positions unless the offer includes a promotion in academic rank.

Since a person's mobility may depend upon the distance of the relocation, the questionnaire was designed for respondents to indicate how

far they would be willing to move to accept a "better" job. This item permitted respondents to select any one of the following eight response categories:

_____Up to a 25 mile radius
_____26 to 50 mile radius
_____51 to 100 mile radius
_____101 to 150 mile radius
_____151 to 200 mile radius
_____201 to 300 mile radius
_____301 to 500 mile radius
_____No limit

An analysis of the responses obtained on this item indicated that almost all of the responses were in either the first two or the last two categories. Consequently, the data was analyzed in terms of a preference to move a short distance, i.e., 0 to 50-mile radius and a willingness to move a long distance, i.e., 301 to no limit. The results of this analysis are shown on Table 64. Distance preference is affected by marital status. One hundred percent of both single females and single males were willing to move a long distance to obtain a better job. However, 84.5 percent of the married males and only 63.5 percent of the married females indicated a willingness to move a long distance to obtain a better job. This finding suggests that single faculty are the most "recruitable," followed by married males and then married females.

Once the data analysis identified which groups were more mobile and how far they were willing to move to obtain a "better" job, the responses were analyzed to determine what constitutes a "better" job. What factors are necessary to successfully recruit even the mobile faculty? Those factors identified by both females and males as characteristics of a "better" job are listed on Table 65. Salary

was the factor mentioned most often by both females and males. The factor mentioned second most often by females was academic rank, whereas geography (location of the job) was the factor mentioned second most often by male respondents. This ordering of priorities may help to explain the data shown on Tables 62 and 63 where it was reported that the higher the academic rank, the less likely the females were to relocate. The remaining "better" job characteristics mentioned by females were: geography, course load, performance opportunity, creative flexibility, department reputation, challenge and community environment. Male respondents mentioned the following additional "better" job characteristics: academic rank, course load, student quality, course assignment, department administration and department reputation. The data presented on Table 65 suggests that the ability of an academic unit to successfully recruit qualified faculty will be directly related to its ability to provide and/or satisfy these "better" job characteristics. Furthermore, the differences between female and male priorities for "better" job characteristics implies that different factors will be needed to successfully recruit qualified females than will be needed to recruit qualified males.

Radio and Television

The questionnaire constructed for Phase II (Appendix F) was mailed to 120 professionals who had been selected at random from the membership directory of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. The first mailing of the questionnaire resulted in a response from 62 people. A second mailing of the questionnaire resulted in an additional 15 responses. This represented a return rate of 64.17 percent for radio and television.

An analysis of the demographic information requested on the questionnaire provided a description of the population surveyed for radio and television in Phase II. Of the 77 respondents, 27 were female and 50 were male. Nine of the 27 females and 40 of the 50 males were married. Only 6 of the 77 respondents identified themselves as a member of a racial minority. Three respondents were Black, one was American Indian, and two were Hispanic. The limited number of minority respondents precluded any analysis of minority mobility. As a result, the data analysis conducted for radio and television only reflects a comparison between female and male mobility. The analysis of demographic data also revealed that 46 percent of the 50 male respondents were employed at a four-year university or college and 48 percent were employed in other educational/instructional broadcasting. However, 78 percent of the 27 female respondents were employed in educational/instructional broadcasting which are not university affiliated.

Tables 66 through 71 report data which is pertinent to determining the "recruitability" of available faculty in radio and television. Three items of information were obtained on the questionnaire: the respondents' assessment of their mobility, the respondents' distance preference for relocation and the respondents' definition of "better" job characteristics. Respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood that they would relocate during the next few years. Sixty-one of the 77 respondents were able to assess their mobility and, therefore, could be used as respondents for the data presented on Tables 66 through 69. Responses obtained on the mobility item were analyzed in terms of tenure status and academic rank. Table 66 reports the mobility of female respondents

Table 66

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--NAEB

Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 0)	Not Tenured(n=23)
VM	0	15 (65%)
NM	0	8 (35%)
	0	100%

Single Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 0)	Not Tenured(n=17)
VM	0	11 (65%)
NM	0	6 (35%)
	0	100%

Married Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 0)	Not Tenured(n= 6)
VM	0	4 (67%)
NM	0	2 (33%)
	0	100%

Table 67

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--NAEB

Male

Mobility	Tenured(n= 6)	Not Tenured(n=32)
VM	1 (17%)	19 (59%)
NM	5 (83%)	13 (41%)
	100%	100%

Single Male

Mobility	Tenured(n= 2)	Not Tenured(n=8)
VM	1 (50%)	5 (62%)
NM	1 (50%)	3 (38%)
	100%	100%

Married Male

Mobility	Tenured(n= 4)	Not Tenured(n=24)
VM	0	14 (58%)
NM	4 (100%)	10 (42%)
	100%	100%

Table 68

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--NAEB

Female
(n=23)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	4.5%	4.5%	0	0	8%	48%
NM	0	0	0	0	0	4.5%	30.5%

Single Female
(n=17)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	6%	6%	0	0	6%	47%
NM	0	0	0	0	0	6%	29%

Married Female
(n= 6)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	0	0	0	16.5%	50%
NM	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.5%

Table 69

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--NAEB

Male
(n=38)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	5.5%	13%	2.5%	0	8%	23%
NM	0	0	2.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	29%

Single Male
(n=10)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	10%	0	10%	0	10%	30%
NM	0	0	10%	0	0	0	30%

Married Male
(n=28)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	3.5%	18%	0	0	7%	21.5%
NM	0	0	0	7%	7%	7%	29%

Table 70

Subjects Indication of Distance Preference in Relocation--NAEB

	Female (n=26)			Male (n=47)		
Distance	Single (n=17)	Married (n= 9)	Total Female	Single (n=10)	Married (n=37)	Total Male
Short (0-50 mi.)	23.5%	44.5%	31%	10%	13.5%	13%
Long (no limit)	76.5%	55.5%	69%	90%	86.5%	87%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 71

Characteristics of a "Better" Job - [illegible]8

Female (n=27)		Male (n=50)	
Salary	70%	Salary	78%
Rank	44%	Geography	44%
Geography	41%	Rank	26%
Course Load	11%	Facilities	12%
Responsibility	11%	Promotion Opportunity	12%
Course Assignment	10%	Tenure	10%
Creative Flexibility	10%	Course Load	10%
Production Budget	10%	Responsibility	10%

and Table 67 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with tenure status. Since none of the female respondents held a tenured position, it was not surprising to learn that tenure did not affect their mobility. Table 66 does show, however, that 65 percent of the females surveyed rated themselves as "very mobile." Furthermore, when this data was analyzed in terms of marital status, the percentage changed only slightly to 65 percent of the single females and 67 percent of the married females rating themselves as "very mobile." Since 16 percent of the 50 male respondents held a tenured position, it was possible to determine the impact of tenure upon the mobility of the male respondents. As shown on Table 67, 100 percent of the tenured married males rated themselves as "not mobile," while 50 percent of the tenured single males rated themselves as "very mobile." This finding suggests that tenure tends to decrease the mobility of married males more than single males.

Table 68 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 69 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with academic rank. A comparison of the data presented on these tables indicates that more male than female respondents held positions with academic rank. No concrete inferences could be made for females regarding the impact of academic rank upon mobility. However, the data on Table 69 suggests that, for males, there is an inverse relationship between academic rank and mobility. Males in radio and television are less mobile at higher academic ranks than at lower ranks.

Since a person's mobility may depend upon the distance of the relocation, the questionnaire was designed for respondents to indicate how far they would be willing to move to accept a "better" job. This question

item permitted respondents to select any one of the following eight response categories:

_____Up to a 25 mile radius
_____26 to 50 mile radius
_____51 to 100 mile radius
_____101 to 150 mile radius
_____151 to 200 mile radius
_____201 to 300 mile radius
_____301 to 500 mile radius
_____No limit

An analysis of the responses obtained on this item indicated that almost all of the responses were in either the first two or the last two categories. Consequently, the data was analyzed in terms of a preference to move a short distance, i.e., 0 to 50-mile radius, and a willingness to move a long distance, i.e., 301 to no limit. The results of this analysis are shown on Table 70. Eighty-seven percent of the male respondents were willing to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job, while only 69 percent of the female respondents were willing to move a long distance. Distance preference is affected by marital status. Seventy-six and one-half percent (76.5%) of the single females, but only 55.5 percent of the married females were willing to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job. Similarly, 90 percent of the single males, but only 86.5 percent of the married males indicated a willingness to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job. This finding suggests that single faculty are most "recruitable," followed by married males and then married females.

Once the data analysis identified which groups were more mobile and how far they were willing to move to obtain a "better" job, the responses were analyzed to determine what constitutes a "better" job.

What factors are necessary to successfully recruit even the mobile faculty? Those factors identified by both females and males as characteristics of a "better" job are listed on Table 71. Salary was the factor mentioned most often by both females and males. The factor mentioned second most often by females was academic rank. Whereas, geography (location of the job) was the factor mentioned second most often by male respondents. The remaining "better" job characteristics mentioned by females were: geography, course load, responsibility, course assignment, creative flexibility, and production budget. Male respondents mentioned the following additional "better" job characteristics: academic rank, facilities, promotion opportunity, tenure, course load, and responsibility. The data presented on Table 71 suggests that the ability of an academic unit to successfully recruit qualified faculty will be directly related to its ability to provide and/or satisfy these "better" job characteristics. Furthermore, the difference between female and male priorities for "better" job characteristics implies that different factors will be needed to successfully recruit qualified females than will be needed to recruit qualified males.

Theater

The questionnaire constructed for Phase II (Appendix F) was mailed to 121 professionals who had been selected at random from the membership directory of the American College Theatre Association. The first mailing of the questionnaire resulted in a response from 54 people. A second mailing of the questionnaire resulted in an additional 24 responses. This represented a return rate of 64.46 percent for theater.

An analysis of the demographic information requested on the questionnaire provided a description of the population surveyed for theater in Phase II. Of the 78 respondents, 21 were female and 57 were male. Nine of the 21 females and 37 of the 57 males were married. None of the respondents identified themselves as a member of a racial minority. As a result, the data analysis conducted for theater only reflects a comparison between female and male mobility. The analysis of demographic data also revealed that only 38 percent of the female respondents were employed at a four-year college or university, while 48 percent of the female respondents were employed in public or commercial theater. However, 74 percent of the male respondents were employed at a four-year college or university and only 16 percent of the male respondents were employed in public or commercial theater.

Tables 72 through 77 report data which is pertinent to determining the "recruitability" of available faculty in theater. Three information items were obtained on the questionnaire: the respondents' assessment of their mobility, the respondents' distance preference for relocation and the respondents' definition of "better" job characteristics. Respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood that they would relocate during the next few years. Sixty-three of the 78 respondents were able to assess their mobility and, therefore, could be used as respondents for the data presented on Tables 72 through 75. Responses obtained on the mobility item were analyzed in terms of tenure status and academic rank. Table 72 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 73 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with tenure status. A comparison of the data presented on the two tables reveals that 75 per-

Table 72

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--ACTA

Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 4)	Not Tenured(n=13)
VM	1 (25%)	11 (85%)
NM	3 (75%)	2 (15%)
	100%	100%

Single Female

Mobility	Tenured(n=2)	Not Tenured(n=9)
VM	1 (50%)	7 (78%)
NM	1 (50%)	2 (22%)
	100%	100%

Married Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 2)	Not Tenured(n= 4)
VM	0	4 (100%)
NM	2 (100%)	0
	100%	100%

Table 73

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--ACTA

Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=19)	Not Tenured(n=27)
VM	3 (16%)	22 (81%)
NM	16 (84%)	5 (19%)
	100%	100%

Single Male

Mobility	Tenured(n= 6)	Not Tenured(n=10)
VM	2 (33%)	9 (90%)
NM	4 (67%)	1 (10%)
	100%	100%

Married Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=13)	Not Tenured(n=17)
VM	1 (8%)	13 (76%)
NM	12 (92%)	4 (24%)
	100%	100%

Table 74

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--ACTA

Female
(n=17)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	12%	17%	0	0	0	41%
NM	0	0	0	12%	6%	0	12%

Single Female
(n=11)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	18%	18%	0	0	0	37%
NM	0	0	0	0	9%	0	18%

Married Female
(n=6)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	16.5%	0	0	0	50%
NM	0	0	0	33.5%	0	0	0

Table 75

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--ACTA

Male
(n=46)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	6.5%	2%	17.5%	6.5%	0	6.5%	15%
NM	0	0	6.5%	11%	22%	2%	4.5%

Single Male
(n=16)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	6.5%	25%	6.5%	0	0	30.5%
NM	0	0	0	12.5%	12.5%	0	6.5%

Married Male
(n=30)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	10%	0	13.5%	6.5%	0	10%	6.5%
NM	0	0	10%	10%	26.5%	3.5%	3.5%

Table 76

Subjects Indication of Distance Preference in Relocation--ACTA

	Female (n=20)			Male (n=55)		
Distance	Single (n=12)	Married (n= 8)	Total Female	Single (n=20)	Married (n=35)	Total Male
Short (0-50 mi.)	16.5%	12.5%	15%	5%	0	2%
Long (no limit)	83.5%	87.5%	85%	95%	100%	98%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 77

Characteristics of a "Better" Job - ACTA

Female (n-21)		Male (n=57)	
Salary	67%	Salary	68%
Geography	33%	Geography	49%
Course Load	33%	Course Load	39%
Rank	24%	Rank	33%
Dept. Reputation	24%	Dept. Reputation	25%
Course Assignment	19%	Course Assignment	11)
Creative Flexibility	14%	Facilities	11%
Student Quality	10%	Student Quality	10%
Fringe Benefits	10%	Programs Offered	10%

cent of the tenured females and 84 percent of the tenured males rated themselves as "not mobile." Furthermore, 100 percent of the married tenured females and 92 percent of the married tenured males rated themselves as "not mobile," while only 50 percent of the single tenured females and 67 percent of the single tenured males did so. This finding suggests that tenure decreases the mobility of married faculty more than single faculty.

Table 74 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 75 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with academic rank. A comparison of the data presented on the two tables indicates some differences in the mobility of each group. Females at the ranks of instructor and assistant professor were mobile, but females at the ranks of associate professor and full professor were not mobile. While the trend of becoming less mobile with the higher ranks was also present among the male respondents, a percentage of males at the ranks of associate professor still assessed themselves as "very mobile." In addition, married males at the higher ranks rated themselves as less mobile than single males at the higher ranks. This finding suggests that for faculty in theater, there is an inverse relationship between academic rank and mobility. This relationship is particularly apparent for females. Females in theater are not mobile at the higher academic ranks. On a pragmatic level, the data implies that it will be difficult to recruit qualified females for senior faculty positions unless the offer includes a promotion in academic rank.

Since a person's mobility may depend upon the distance of the relocation, the questionnaire was designed for respondents to indicate how far they would be willing to move to accept a "better" job. This question item permitted respondents to select any one of the following eight response categories:

_____Up to a 25 mile radius
_____25 to 50 mile radius
_____51 to 100 mile radius
_____101 to 150 mile radius
_____151 to 200 mile radius
_____201 to 300 mile radius
_____301 to 500 mile radius
_____No limit

An analysis of the responses obtained on this item indicated that almost all of the responses were in either the first two or the last two categories. Consequently, the data was analyzed in terms of a preference to move a short distance, i.e., 0 to 50-mile radius, and a willingness to move a long distance, i.e., 301 to no limit. The results of this analysis are shown on Table 76. Ninety-eight percent of the male respondents and 85 percent of the female respondents were willing to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job. However, 100 percent of the married males were willing to move a long distance, while only 87.5 percent of the married females were willing to move a long distance. Still, for both females and males, a larger percentage of married faculty were willing to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job than single faculty. This finding suggests that married males are most "recruitable," followed by single males and then married females.

Once the data analysis identified which groups were more mobile and how far they would move to obtain a "better" job, the responses were analyzed to determine what constitutes a "better" job. What factors are necessary to successfully recruit even the mobile faculty? Those factors identified by both females and males as characteristics of a "better" job are listed on Table 77. Salary was the factor mentioned most often by both females and males. Both females and males identified geography (location of the job) as the second factor, course load as the third factor, rank as the fourth factor, department's reputation as the fifth factor, and course assignment as the sixth factor. There is no disagreement between female and male priorities for "better" job characteristics until the seventh factor. At that point, females were concerned with creative flexibility and males were concerned with facilities. The data presented on Table 77 suggests that the ability of an academic unit to successfully recruit qualified faculty will be directly related to its ability to provide and/or satisfy these "better" job characteristics.

Speech Pathology and Audiology

The questionnaire constructed for Phase II (Appendix F) was mailed to 106 professionals who had been selected at random from the membership directory of the American Speech and Hearing Association. The first mailing of the questionnaire resulted in a response from 40 people. A second mailing of the questionnaire resulted in an additional 19 responses. This represented a return rate of 54.72 percent for speech pathology and audiology.

An analysis of the demographic information requested on the questionnaire provided a description of the population surveyed for speech pathology and audiology in Phase II. Of the 59 respondents, 36 were female and 23 were male. Twenty of the 36 females and 19 of the 23 males were married. None of the respondents identified themselves as a member of a racial minority. As a result, the data analysis conducted for speech pathology and audiology only reflects a comparison between female and male mobility. The analysis of demographic data also revealed that 34 percent of the respondents were employed at a four-year college or university, 29 percent were employed in clinical areas, and only 12 percent were employed in private practice.

Tables 78 through 83 report data which is pertinent to determining the "recruitability" of available faculty in speech pathology and audiology. Three information items were obtained on the questionnaire: the respondents' assessment of their mobility, the respondents' distance preference for relocation and the respondents' definition of "better" job characteristics. Respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood that they would relocate during the next few years. Fifty-one of the 59 respondents were able to assess their mobility and, therefore, could be used as respondents for the data presented on Tables 78 through 81. Responses obtained on the mobility item were analyzed in terms of tenure status and academic rank. Table 78 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 79 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with tenure status. A comparison of the data presented on the two tables reveals that 82 percent of the tenured females and 75 percent of the tenured males rated themselves as "not mobile." However, as a

Table 78

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--ASHA

Female

Mobility	Tenured(n=11)	Not Tenured(n=22)
VM	2 (18%)	13 (59%)
NM	9 (82%)	9 (41%)
	100%	100%

Single Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 6)	Not Tenured(n=8)
VM	2 (33%)	7 (87%)
NM	4 (67%)	1 (13%)
	100%	100%

Married Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 5)	Not Tenured(n=14)
VM	0	6 (43%)
NM	5 (100%)	8 (57%)
	100%	100%

Table 79

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--ASHA

Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=8)	Not Tenured(n=10)
VM	2 (25%)	3 (30%)
NM	6 (75%)	7 (70%)
	100%	100%

Single Male

Mobility	Tenured(n= 3)	Not Tenured(n=1)
VM	1 (33%)	0
NM	2 (67%)	1 (100%)
	100%	100%

Married Male

Mobility	Tenured(n= 5)	Not Tenured(n=9)
VM	1 (20%)	3 (33%)
NM	4 (80%)	6 (67%)
	100%	100%

Table 80

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--ASHA

Female
(n=33)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	6%	9%	3%	3%	0	25%
NM	0	3%	6%	12%	15%	3%	15%

Single Female
(n=14)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	14.5%	7%	7%	0	36%
NM	0	0	7%	0	21.5%	0	7%

Married Female
(n=19)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	10.5%	5.5%	0	0	0	15%
NM	0	5.5%	5.5%	21%	10.5%	5.5%	21%

Table 81

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--ASHA

Male
(n=18)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	11%	0
NM	0	0	16.5%	22.5%	11%	0	22.5%

Single Male
(n= 4)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	0	0	25%	0	0
NM	0	0	0	25%	25%	0	25%

Married Male
(n=14)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	7%	7%	0	14.5%	0
NM	0	0	21.5%	21.5%	7%	0	21.5%

Table 82

Subjects Indication of Distance Preference in Relocation--ASHA

	Female (n=35)			Male (n=23)		
Distance	Single (n=16)	Married (n=19)	Total Female	Single (n=4)	Married (n=19)	Total Male
Short (0-50 mi.)	25%	47.5%	37%	0	10.5%	8.5%
Long (no limit)	75%	52.5%	63%	100%	89.5%	91.5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 83

Characteristics of a "Better" Job - ASHA

Female (n=36)		Male (n=23)	
Salary	64%	Salary	78%
Geography	44%	Geography	57%
Course Load	42%	Rank	43%
Rank	22%	Course Load	26%
Dept. Reputation	19%	Research Time	13%
Research Time	10%	Dept. Reputation	13%
Tenure	10%		

group, single tenured females were more mobile than married tenured females and single tenured males were more mobile than married tenured males. This finding suggests that tenure tends to decrease the mobility of married faculty more than single faculty.

Table 80 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 81 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with academic rank. The data presented on Table 80 suggests that, as a group, married females are less mobile than single females. In addition, the degree of mobility seems to decrease as academic rank increases. Females in speech pathology and audiology become less mobile as their academic rank increases. This inverse relationship between mobility and rank is not apparent in the data presented on Table 81 which reflects the mobility of male respondents. On a pragmatic level, the data implies that it will be difficult to recruit qualified females for senior faculty positions.

Since a person's mobility may depend upon the distance of the relocation, the questionnaire was designed for respondents to indicate how far they would be willing to move to accept a "better" job. This question item permitted respondents to select any one of the following eight response categories:

_____Up to a 25 mile radius
_____26 to 50 mile radius
_____51 to 100 mile radius
_____101 to 150 mile radius
_____151 to 200 mile radius
_____201 to 300 mile radius
_____301 to 500 mile radius
_____No limit

An analysis of the responses obtained on this item indicated that almost all of the responses were in either the first two or the last two categories. Consequently, the data was analyzed in terms of a preference to

move a short distance, i.e., 0 to 50-mile radius, and a willingness to move a long distance, i.e., 301 to no limit. The results of this analysis are shown on Table 82. Ninety-one and one-half percent (91.5%) of the male respondents were willing to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job, but only 63 percent of the female respondents were willing to move a long distance. In both female and male groups, a larger percentage of single respondents were willing to move a long distance than married respondents. This finding suggests that single males are the most "recruitable," followed by married males and then single females.

Once the data analysis identified which groups were more mobile and how far they would move to obtain a "better" job, the responses were analyzed to determine what constitutes a "better" job. What factors are necessary to successfully recruit even the mobile faculty? Those factors identified by both females and males as characteristics of a "better" job are listed on Table 83. Salary was the factor mentioned most often by both females and males. The factor mentioned second most often by both females and males was geography (location of the job). After the second factor, females and males did not agree on "better" job characteristics. The other "better" job characteristics mentioned by females were: course load, academic rank, department reputation, research time, and tenure. Male respondents mentioned the following additional "better" job characteristics: academic rank, course load, research time, and department reputation. The data presented on Table 83 suggests that the ability of an academic unit to successfully recruit qualified faculty will be directly related to its ability to provide and/or satisfy these "better" job characteristics. Furthermore, the difference between female and male

priorities for "better" job characteristics implies that different factors will be needed to successfully recruit qualified females than will be needed to successfully recruit qualified males.

Speech Communication

The questionnaire constructed for Phase II (Appendix F) was mailed to 121 professionals who had been selected at random from the membership directory of the Speech Communication Association. The first mailing of the questionnaire resulted in a response from 56 people. A second mailing of the questionnaire resulted in an additional 14 responses. This represented a return rate of 57.85 percent for speech communication.

An analysis of the demographic information requested on the questionnaire provided a description of the population surveyed for speech communication in Phase II. Of the 70 respondents, 37 were female and 33 were male. Twenty-one of the 37 females and 28 of the 33 males were married. None of the respondents identified themselves as a member of a racial minority. As a result, the data analysis conducted for speech communication only reflects a comparison between female and male mobility. The analysis of the demographic data also revealed that of the 70 respondents, 80 percent taught at a four-year college or university and 46 percent were tenured. Information regarding the rank of the respondents varied with each sex. Of the 33 male respondents, 33 percent held the rank of full professor, 21 percent held the rank of associate professor, and 27 percent held the rank of assistant professor. Of the 37 female respondents, only 5 percent held the rank of full professor, 16 percent held the rank of associate professor, but 30 percent held the rank of assistant professor, and 16 percent held the rank of instructor.

Tables 84 through 89 report data which is pertinent to determining the "recruitability" of available faculty in speech communication. Three information items were obtained on the questionnaire: the respondents' assessment of their mobility, the respondents' distance preference for relocation, and the respondents' definition of "better" job characteristics. Respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood that they would relocate during the next few years. Fifty-eight of the 70 respondents were able to assess their mobility and, therefore, could be used as respondents for the data presented on Tables 84 through 87. Responses obtained on the mobility item were analyzed in terms of tenure status and academic rank. Table 84 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 85 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with tenure status. A comparison of the data presented on the two tables reveals that 100 percent of the tenured females and 79 percent of the tenured males rated themselves as "not mobile." This finding suggests that tenure decreases the mobility of female faculty more than male faculty.

Table 86 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 87 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with academic rank. The data presented on Table 86 indicates that while a percentage of the females at the ranks of instructor and assistant professor are mobile, females at the ranks of associate professor and full professor are not mobile. In addition, married females are less mobile than single females. However, the data presented on Table 87 indicates that a percentage of males are mobile at all ranks. This finding suggests that, for females in speech communication, there is an inverse relationship between academic rank and mobility. On a pragmatic level, the data

Table 84

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--SCA

Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 9)	Not Tenured(n=21)
VM	0	13 (62%)
NM	9 (100%)	8 (38%)
	100%	100%

Single Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 5)	Not Tenured(n= 8)
VM	0	6 (75%)
NM	5 (100%)	2 (25%)
	100%	100%

Married Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 4)	Not Tenured(n=13)
VM	0	7 (54%)
NM	4 (100%)	6 (46%)
	100%	100%

Table 85

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--SCA

Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=19)	Not Tenured(n=9)
VM	4 (21%)	8 (89%)
NM	15 (79%)	1 (11%)
	100%	100%

Single Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=2)	Not Tenured(n=2)
VM	0	2 (100%)
NM	2 (100%)	0
	100%	100%

Married Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=17)	Not Tenured(n=7)
VM	4 (24%)	6 (86%)
NM	13 (76%)	1 (14%)
	100%	100%

Table 86

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--SCA

Female
(n=30)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	13%	10%	10%	0	0	0	10%
NM	0	3%	17%	17%	7%	3%	10%

Single Female
(n=13)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	31%	7.5%	0	0	0	0	7.5%
NM	0	0	15.5%	23.5%	7.5%	0	7.5%

Married Female
(n=17)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	12%	17%	0	0	0	12%
NM	0	6%	17%	12%	6%	6%	12%

Table 87

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--SCA

Male
(n=28)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	3.5%	18%	3.5%	11%	7%	0
NM	0	0	3.5%	14%	36%	3.5%	0

Single Male
(n=4)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	0	0	0	50%	0
NM	0	0	0	0	50%	0	0

Married Male
(n=24)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	4%	21%	4%	12.5%	0	0
NM	0	0	4%	17%	33.5%	4%	0

Table 88

Subjects Indication of Distance Preference in Relocation--SCA

	Female (n=36)			Male (n=32)		
Distance	Single (n=16)	Married (n=20)	Total Female	Single (n=5)	Married (n=27)	Total Male
Short (0-50 mi.)	19%	35%	28%	0	11%	9%
Long (no limit)	81%	65%	72%	100%	89%	91%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 89

Characteristics of a "Better" Job - SCA

Female (n=37)		Male (n=33)	
Salary	73%	Salary	76%
Geography	51%	Geography	61%
Rank	35%	Rank	45%
Course Load	27%	Course Load	36%
Course Assignment	14%	Course Assignment	15%
Dept. Reputation	14%	Dept. Reputation	12%
Program Offerings	11%	Tenure	10%
Dual Employment	10%		
Research Time	10%		

implies that it will be difficult to recruit qualified females for senior faculty positions unless the offer includes a promotion in academic rank.

Since a person's mobility may depend upon the distance of the relocation, the questionnaire was designed for respondents to indicate how far they would be willing to move to accept a "better" job. This question item permitted respondents to select any one of the following eight response categories:

_____Up to a 25 mile radius
_____26 to 50 mile radius
_____51 to 100 mile radius
_____101 to 150 mile radius
_____151 to 200 mile radius
_____201 to 300 mile radius
_____301 to 500 mile radius
_____No limit

An analysis of the responses obtained on this item indicated that almost all of the responses were in either the first two or the last two categories. Consequently, the data was analyzed in terms of a preference to move a short distance, i.e., 0 to 50-mile radius, and a willingness to move a long distance, i.e., 301 to no limit. The results of this analysis are shown on Table 88. Ninety-one percent of the male respondents and 72 percent of the female respondents were willing to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job. In both groups, females and males, a larger percentage of single respondents were willing to move a long distance than married respondents. Still, 89 percent of the married males and 65 percent of the married females indicated a willingness to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job. This finding suggests that single males are the most "recruitable," followed by married males and then single females.

Once the data analysis identified which groups were more mobile and how far they would move to obtain a "better" job, the responses were analyzed to determine what constitutes a "better" job. What factors are necessary to successfully recruit even the mobile faculty? Those factors identified by both females and males as characteristics of a "better" job are listed on Table 89. The data presented indicates that the first six factors are the same for both females and males. Salary was the factor mentioned most often and geography (location of the job) was the factor mentioned second most often. The remaining factors mentioned by both females and males were academic rank, course load, course assignment, and department reputation. Females and males differed on the seventh factor. Program offerings was the seventh factor mentioned by female respondents and tenure was the seventh factor mentioned by male respondents. The data presented on Table 89 suggests that the ability of an academic unit to successfully recruit qualified faculty will be directly related to its ability to provide and/or satisfy these "better" job characteristics.

Cinema

The questionnaire constructed for Phase II (Appendix F) was mailed to 124 professionals who had been selected at random from the membership directory of the University Film Association. The first mailing of the questionnaire resulted in a response from 52 people. A second mailing of the questionnaire resulted in an additional 36 responses. This represented a return rate of 70.97 percent for cinema.

An analysis of the demographic information requested on the questionnaire provided a description of the population surveyed for cinema in Phase II. Of the 88 respondents, 23 were female and 65 were male. Ten

of the 23 females and 51 of the 65 males were married. None of the respondents identified themselves as a member of a racial minority. As a result, the data analysis conducted for cinema only reflects a comparison between female and male mobility. The analysis of the demographic data also revealed that of the 88 respondents, 91 percent taught at a four-year college or university and 50 percent were tenured. Information regarding academic rank of the respondents varied with each sex. Of the 65 male respondents, 26 percent held the rank of full professor, 26 percent held the rank of associate professor, 26 percent held the rank of assistant professor, and 8 percent held the rank of instructor. Of the 23 female respondents, only 13 percent held the rank of full professor, 17 percent held the rank of associate professor, but 30 percent held the rank of assistant professor and 17 percent held the rank of instructor.

Tables 90 through 95 report data which is pertinent to determining the "recruitability" of available faculty in cinema. Three information items were obtained on the questionnaire: the respondents' assessment of their mobility, the respondents' distance preference for relocation, and the respondents' definition of "better" job characteristics. Respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood that they would relocate during the next few years. Seventy-four of the 88 respondents were able to assess their mobility and, therefore, could be used as respondents for the data presented on Tables 90 through 93. Responses obtained on the mobility item were analyzed in terms of tenure status and academic rank. Table 90 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 91 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with tenure status.

Table 90

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--UFA

Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 6)	Not Tenured(n=14)
VM	1 (17%)	10 (71%)
NM	5 (83%)	4 (29%)
	100%	100%

Single Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 2)	Not Tenured(n=10)
VM	1 (50%)	8 (80%)
NM	1 (50%)	2 (20%)
	100%	100%

Married Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 4)	Not Tenured(n=4)
VM	0	2 (50%)
NM	4 (100%)	2 (50%)
	100%	100%

Table 91

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--UFA

Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=29)	Not Tenured(n=25)
VM	8 (28%)	18 (72%)
NM	21 (72%)	7 (28%)
	100%	100%

Single Male

Mobility	Tenured(n= 3)	Not Tenured(n=10)
VM	1 (33%)	8 (80%)
NM	2 (67%)	2 (20%)
	100%	100%

Married Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=26)	Not Tenured(n=15)
VM	7 (27%)	10 (67%)
NM	19 (73%)	5 (33%)
	100%	100%

Table 92

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--UFA

Female
(n=20)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	5%	10%	20%	0	0	10%	5%
NM	0	10%	10%	15%	10%	5%	0

Single Female
(n=12)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	8%	8%	26%	0	0	17%	8%
NM	0	8%	17%	8%	0	0	0

Married Female
(n= 8)

	Academic Rank						
Mobility	Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	12.5%	12.5%	0	0	0	0
NM	0	12.5%	0	25%	25%	12.5%	0

Table 93

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--UFA

Male
(n=54)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	2%	2%	18.5%	7.5%	5.5%	9.5%	3.5%
NM	0	3.5%	11%	13%	24%	0	0

Single Male
(n=13)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	8%	0	38%	0	0	8%	15%
NM	0	0	15%	8%	8%	0	0

Married Male
(n=41)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	2.5%	12%	10%	7%	10%	0
NM	0	5%	10%	14.5%	29%	0	0

Table 94

Subjects Indication of Distance Preference in Relocation--UFA

	Female (n=23)			Male (n=65)		
Distance	Single (n=13)	Married (n=10)	Total Female	Single (n=14)	Married (n=51)	Total Male
Short (0-50 mi.)	38.5%	50%	43.5%	14%	10%	11%
Long (no limit)	61.5%	50%	56.5%	86%	90%	89%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 95

Characteristics of a "Better" Job - UFA

Female (n=23)		Male (n=65)	
Salary	74%	Salary	71%
Geography	52%	Geography	34%
Rank	35%	Dept. Reputation	29%
Course Load	30%	Course Load	28%
Course Assignment	22%	Rank	23%
Dept. Reputation	17%	Facilities	20%
Tenure	13%	Course Assignment	11%
Facilities	10%	Tenure	10%
Research Time	10%	Student Quality	10%
Promotion Opportunity	10%		

A comparison of the data presented on the tables reveals that 83 percent of the tenured females and 72 percent of the tenured males rated themselves as "not mobile." Furthermore, none of the tenured married females and only 27 percent of the tenured married males rated themselves as "mobile." This finding suggests that tenure decreases the mobility of female faculty more than male faculty.

Table 92 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 93 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with academic rank. The data presented on Table 92 indicates that while a percentage of the female respondents at the ranks of instructor and assistant professor are mobile, the females at the ranks of associate professor and full professor are not mobile. However, as shown on Table 93, a percentage of male respondents at all academic ranks are mobile. In addition, for both females and males, married respondents are less mobile than single respondents. This finding suggests that for faculty in cinema, there is an inverse relationship between academic rank and mobility. This relationship is particularly apparent for females. Females in cinema are not mobile at the higher academic ranks. On a pragmatic level, the data implies that it will be difficult to recruit qualified females for senior faculty positions unless the offer includes a promotion in academic rank.

Since a person's mobility may depend upon the distance of the relocation, the questionnaire was designed for respondents to indicate how far they would be willing to move to accept a "better" position. This question item permitted respondents to select any one of the following eight response categories:

_____Up to a 25 mile radius
_____26 to 50 mile radius
_____51 to 100 mile radius
_____101 to 150 mile radius
_____151 to 200 mile radius
_____201 to 300 mile radius
_____301 to 500 mile radius
_____No limit

An analysis of the responses obtained on this item indicated that almost all of the responses were in either the first two or the last two categories. Consequently, the data was analyzed in terms of a preference to move a short distance, i.e., 0 to 50 mile radius, or a willingness to move a long distance, i.e., 301 to no limit. The results of this analysis are shown on Table 94. Eighty-nine percent of the male respondents, but only only 56.5 p-rcent of the female respondents, were willing to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job. Sixty-one and one-half percent (61.5%) of the single females, but only 50 percent of the married females were willing to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job. However, 86 percent of the single males and 90 percent of the married males were willing to move a long distance. This finding suggests that married males are the most "recruitable," followed by single males and then single females.

Once the data analysis identified which groups were more mobile and how far they would move to obtain a "better" job, the responses were analyzed to determine what constitutes a "better" job. What factors are necessary to successfully recruit even the mobile faculty? Those factors identified by both females and males as characteristics of a "better" job are listed on Table 95. Salary was the factor mentioned most often by both females and males, and geography (location of the job)

was the factor mentioned second most often by both groups. The remaining "better" job characteristics mentioned by females were: academic rank, course load, course assignment, department reputation, tenure, facilities, research time, and promotion opportunity. Male respondents mentioned the following additional "better" job characteristics: department reputation, course load, academic rank, facilities, course assignment, tenure, and student quality. The data presented on Table 95 suggests that the ability of an academic unit to successfully recruit qualified faculty will be directly related to its ability to provide and/or satisfy these "better" job characteristics. Furthermore, the differences between female and male priorities for "better" job characteristics implies that different factors will be needed to successfully recruit qualified females than will be needed to recruit qualified males.

Journalism

The questionnaire constructed for Phase II (Appendix F) was mailed to 98 professionals who had been selected at random from the membership directory of the Association for Educational Journalism. The first mailing of the questionnaire resulted in a response from 46 people. A second mailing of the questionnaire resulted in an additional 23 responses. This represented a return rate of 70.41 percent for journalism.

An analysis of the demographic information requested on the questionnaire provided a description of the population surveyed for journalism in Phase II. Of the 69 respondents, 16 were female and 53 were male. Nine of the 16 females and 49 of the 53 males were married. None of the respondents identified themselves as a member of a racial minority. As a result, the data analysis conducted for journalism only reflects a

comparison between female and male mobility. The analysis of the demographic data also revealed that of the 69 respondents, 91 percent taught at a four-year college or university and 74 percent were tenured. Information regarding the academic rank of the respondents varied with each sex. Of the 53 male respondents, 53 percent held the rank of full professor, 30 percent held the rank of associate professor, 8 percent held the rank of assistant professor, and 2 percent held the rank of instructor. Of the 16 female respondents, only 31 percent held the rank of full professor, 31 percent held the rank of associate professor, and 19 percent held the rank of assistant professor.

Tables 96 through 101 report data which is pertinent to determining the "recruitability" of available faculty in journalism. Three information items were obtained on the questionnaire: the respondents' assessment of their mobility, the respondents' distance preference for relocation, and the respondents' definition of "better" job characteristics. Respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood that they would relocate during the next few years. Sixty-one of the 69 respondents were able to assess their mobility and, therefore, could be used as respondents in the data presented on Tables 96 through 99. Responses obtained on the mobility item were analyzed in terms of tenure status and academic rank. Table 96 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 97 reports the mobility of male respondents in terms of tenure status. A comparison of the data presented on the two tables reveals that 100 percent of the tenured females and 82 percent of the tenured males rated themselves as "not mobile." In addition, 75 percent of the single tenured males, but 83 percent of the married tenured males, rated themselves as "not

Table 96

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--AEJ

Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 7)	Not Tenured(n= 4)
VM	0	3 (75%)
NM	7 (100%)	1 (25%)
	100%	100%

Single Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 4)	Not Tenured(n= 0)
VM	0	0
NM	4 (100%)	0
	100%	0

Married Female

Mobility	Tenured(n= 3)	Not Tenured(n= 4)
VM	0	3 (75%)
NM	3 (100%)	1 (25%)
	100%	100%

Table 97

Tenure Status of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--AEJ

Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=40)	Not Tenured(n=10)
VM	7 (18%)	6 (60%)
NM	33 (82%)	4 (40%)
	100%	100%

Single Male

Mobility	Tenured(n= 4)	Not Tenured(n= 0)
VM	1 (25%)	0
NM	3 (75%)	0
	100%	0

Married Male

Mobility	Tenured(n=36)	Not Tenured(n=10)
VM	6 (17%)	6 (60%)
NM	30 (83%)	4 (40%)
	100%	100%

Table 98

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Female Subjects--AEJ

Female
(n=11)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	9%	0	9%	9%	0	0	0
NM	0	0	9%	18%	46%	0	0

Single Female
(n= 4)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NM	0	0	0	25%	75%	0	0

Married Female
(n= 7)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	14.5%	0	14.5%	14.5%	0	0	0
NM	0	0	14.5%	14.5%	27.5%	0	0

Table 99

Academic Rank of Very Mobile (VM) and Not Mobile (NM) Male Subjects--AEJ

Male
(n=50)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	2%	4%	4%	12%	4%	0
NM	0	0	2%	26%	42%	0	4%

Single Male
(n= 4)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	0	0	25%	0	0	0
NM	0	0	0	25%	50%	0	0

Married Male
(n=46)

Mobility	Academic Rank: Graduate Assistant	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Other	N/A
VM	0	2%	4.5%	2%	13%	4.5%	0
NM	0	0	2%	26%	41.5%	0	4.5%

Table 100

Subjects Indication of Distance Preference in Relocation--AEJ

	Female (n=16)			Male (n=50)		
Distance	Single (n=7)	Married (n=9)	Total Female	Single (n=4)	Married (n=46)	Total Male
Short (0-50 mi.)	28.5%	22%	25%	50%	11%	14%
Long (no limit)	71.5%	78%	75%	50%	89%	86%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 101

Characteristics of a "Better" Job - AEJ

Female (n=16)		Male (n=53)	
Salary	63%	Salary	58%
Geography	44%	Geography	34%
Rank	38%	Course Load	21%
Research Time	31%	Rank	19%
Course Load	25%	Dept. Reputation	13%
Tenure	13%	Administrative Position	11%

mobile." This finding suggests that tenure decreases the mobility of female faculty more than male faculty and the mobility of married males more than single males.

Table 98 reports the mobility of female respondents and Table 99 reports the mobility of male respondents in accordance with academic rank. The data presented on Table 98 indicates that while a percentage of females are mobile at the ranks of instructor, assistant professor and associate professor, females are not mobile at the rank of full professor. In contrast, the data shown on Table 99 indicates that a percentage of males are mobile at all ranks. This finding suggests that there is an inverse relationship between academic rank and mobility. This relationship is particularly apparent for females. Females in journalism are not mobile at the rank of full professor. On a pragmatic level, the data implies that it will be difficult to recruit qualified females for senior faculty position unless the offer includes a promotion in academic rank.

Since a person's mobility may depend upon the distance of the relocation, the questionnaire was designed for respondents to indicate how far they would be willing to move to accept a "better" job. This question item permitted respondents to select any one of the following eight categories:

_____Up to a 25 mile radius
_____26 to 50 mile radius
_____51 to 100 mile radius
_____101 to 150 mile radius
_____151 to 200 mile radius
_____201 to 300 mile radius
_____301 to 500 mile radius
_____No limit

An analysis of the responses obtained on this item indicated that almost all of the responses were in either the first two or the last two categories. Consequently, the data was analyzed in terms of a preference to move a short distance, i.e., 0 to 50 mile radius, or a willingness to move a long distance, i.e., 301 to no limit. The results of this analysis are shown on Table 100. Eighty-six percent of the males and 75 percent of the females were willing to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job. However, 78 percent of the married females, but only 71.5 percent of the single females and 89 percent of the married males, but only 50 percent of the single males were willing to move a long distance to obtain a "better" job. This finding suggests that married males are the most "recruitable," followed by married females and then single females.

Once the data analysis identified which groups were mobile and how far they would move to obtain a "better" job, the responses were analyzed to determine what constitutes a "better" job. What factors are necessary to successfully recruit even the mobile faculty? Those factors identified by both females and males as characteristics of a "better" job are listed on Table 101. Salary was the factor mentioned most often by both females and males, and geography (location of the job) was the factor mentioned second most often. Females and males did not agree on the remaining factors. Academic rank emerged as the third factor among the female respondents, while course load was the third factor mentioned by the male respondents. This ordering of priorities may help to explain the data presented in Table 98, where it was reported that females at the rank of full professor are not mobile. The remain-

ing "better" job characteristics mentioned by females were: research time, course load, and tenure. Male respondents mentioned the following additional "better" job characteristics: academic rank, department reputation, and administrative position. The data presented on Table 101 suggests that the ability of an academic unit to successfully recruit qualified faculty will be directly related to its ability to provide and/or satisfy these "better" job characteristics. Furthermore, the differences between female and male priorities for "better" job characteristics implies that different factors will be needed to successfully recruit qualified females than will be needed to recruit qualified males.

Chapter IV

Conclusions

As long as colleges and universities rely on government funds, there will be a need to be sensitive and responsive to affirmative action policy and pressures. College and university administrators will need to formulate affirmative action policy, establish utilization goals for hiring females and minorities, and adopt recruitment procedures which permit the actualization of those utilization goals.

No matter how admirable or desirable the purpose of affirmative action policy is, there exists a need on the part of college and university administrators to help government formulate affirmative action policy which is realistic in light of college and university staffing needs, academic standards and financial resources. This requires that college and university administrators know more than just the number of "available" females and minorities who hold the appropriate degree(s) requisite for employment. It requires that administrators know what percentage of those "available" are actually "recruitable" and what factors are necessary in order to successfully recruit qualified females and minorities. In addition, college and university administrators should have a clear assessment of their institution's ability to provide those factors which will enable them to successfully recruit qualified females and minorities. For example, this study indicated that salary was the "better" job characteristic mentioned most often by both females and males in seven different curricular divisions. Simply knowing that higher salaries will enhance a recruitment effort is not

sufficient. Administrators need to assess their ability, relative to the ability of administrators at other colleges and universities, to offer competitive salaries to qualified females and minorities. This kind of information will enable college and university administrators to assist government in formulating affirmative action policy and goals which are realistic in terms of the higher education institution's staffing needs, academic standards and financial resources.

REFERENCE

Corbitt, G. I. Availability Data in Academic Professions and Related Occupations. (2nd ed.) Boulder, Colorado: Affirmative Action Office, University of Colorado, 1978.

Appendix A

Graduate Program Directories

Art

American Art Directory

Music

Index to Graduate Degrees in Music

Radio and Television

Directory of Graduate Programs in the Speech Communication Arts and Sciences

A Study of Motion Picture, Still Photography, and Graphic Arts Instruction

Theatre

Directory of American College Theatre

American Theatre Association, 1978 Directory

Directory of Graduate Programs in the Speech Communication Arts and Sciences

Speech Pathology and Audiology

A Guide to Graduate Education in Speech Pathology and Audiology

Directory of Graduate Programs in the Speech Communication Arts and Sciences

Speech Communication

Directory of Graduate Programs in the Speech Communication Arts and Sciences

Speech Communication Directory, 1979-1980

Cinema

A Study of Motion Picture, Still Photography, and Graphic Arts Instruction

Directory of Graduate Programs in the Speech Communication Arts and Sciences

Photography

A Study of Motion Picture, Still Photography, and Graphic Arts Instruction

American Art Directory

Journalism

Journalism Abstracts

1978 Editor and Publisher International Yearbook

Appendix B

Comprehensive List of Programs Offerring Degrees Required for Faculty Employment in the CCFA

Department of Art
Auburn University

Department of Art
University of Alabama

Department of Art
Arizona State University

Art Department
University of Arkansas

Department of Art and History of Art
University of California @ Berkeley

Art Department
University of California @ Davis

Studio Art Department
University of California @ Irvine

Visual Arts Department
University of California @ San Diego

Art Department
California State University @ Long Beach

Otis Art Institute

Department of Art
University of California @ Los Angeles

Department of Fine Arts
University of Southern California

California College of Arts and Crafts

Art Department
Mills College

Art Center College of Design @ Pasadena

Academy of Art College @ San Francisco

Art Department
Lone Mountain College

San Francisco Art Institute

Art Department
San Jose State University

Department of Art
University of Virginia

School of the Arts
Virginia Commonwealth University

Department of Art
Central Washington University

Fine Arts Department
Washington State University

School of Art
University of Washington

Art Department
University of Puget Sound

Division of Art
West Virginia University

Department of Art
University of Wisconsin

Department of Art History
University of Wisconsin

Department of Art
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Department of Art
University of Wyoming

Department of Art and Design
University of Illinois

Department of Art
University of California @ Santa Barbara

Department of Art
Idaho State University

Department of Art
Fort Hays State University

Department of Art and Art History
Wayne State University

Division of Art & Design
New York State College of Ceramics @ Alfred University

ART Continued

Department of Art
Stanford University

California Institute of the Arts

Fine Arts Department
University of Colorado

School of Art
University of Denver

Art Department
Colorado State University

School of Art
Yale University

Hartford Art School
University of Hartford

Department of Art
University of Delaware

Department of Fine Arts
American University

Department of Art
George Washington University

Department of Art
Howard University

Department of Art
University of Miami

Department of Art
University of Florida

Department of Art
Florida State University

Art Department
University of South Florida

Department of the History of Art
Emory University

Department of Art
University of Georgia

Department of Art
University of Idaho

Schools of the Art Institute of Chicago

Department of The History of Art
Yale University

Department of Art Education and Constructive Design
Florida State University

Department of Art, History of Art
University of Chicago

Practice of Art
University of Chicago

Department of Art
University of Illinois @ Chicago Circle

Department of Art
Northern Illinois University

Department of Art
Southern Illinois University @ Edwardsville

Department of Art
Northwestern University

Department of Art History
Northwestern University

Department of Art
Illinois State University

School of Art
Bradley University

Department of Fine Arts
Indiana University

Art Department
Ball State University

Department of Art
University of Notre Dame

Department of Art
Indiana State University

Art Department
Drake University

School of Art and Art History
University of Iowa

ART Continued

Department of Design
University of Kansas

Department of Painting and Sculpture
University of Kansas

Department of History of Art
University of Kansas

Department of Visual Arts Education
University of Kansas

Division of Art
Wichita State University

Department of Art
University of Kentucky

Fine Arts Department
Louisiana State University @ Baton Rouge

Art Department
Newcomb College @ Tulane University

Department of Fine Arts
University of New Orleans

College of Art
Maryland Institute

Art Department
University of Maryland

Department of Art
University of Massachusetts

School of the Arts
Boston University

Massachusetts College of Art

School of the Museum of Fine Arts @ Boston

College of Fine and Applied Arts
Southeastern Massachusetts University

School of Art
University of Michigan

Department of History of Art
University of Michigan

Department of Art
Michigan State University

Art Department
Western Michigan University

Art Department
Eastern Michigan University

Department of Art History
University of Minnesota

Department of Studio Art
University of Minnesota

School of the Associated Arts @ St. Paul

Design Department
University of Minnesota

Department of Art
Mississippi University for Women

Department of Art
University of Mississippi

Art Department
University of Missouri

Department of Art History & Archaeology
University of Missouri

School of Fine Arts
Washington University

Art Department
University of Montana

Department of Art
University of Nebraska @ Lincoln

Program in Art History
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Program in Studio Art
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Department of Art & Archaeology
Princeton University

Department of Art
New Mexico State University

ART Continued

Department of Art & Art History
State University of New York @ Binghamton

Art Department
Herbert H. Lehman College

Art Department
C.W. Post Center of Long Island University

Department of Art & Art History
State University of New York

Department of Art
Cornell University

Studio Art Department
State University of New York College @ New Paltz

Graduate Department-Art
Columbia University

Department of Art & Education
Columbia University

Institute of Fine Arts
New York University

Department of Art Education & Division of Creative Arts
New York University

School of Art and Design
Rochester Institute of Technology

School of American Craftsman
Rochester Institute of Technology

School of Art
Syracuse University

Art Department
University of North Carolina @ Chapel Hill

Art Department
University of North Carolina @ Greensboro

School of Art
East Carolina University

School of Art
Ohio University

College of Design, Architecture and Art
University of Cincinnati

Department of Art
Case Western Reserve University

Division of Art
Ohio State University

Division of Art Education
Ohio State University

Division of History of Art
Ohio State University

School of Art
Kent State University

Department of Art
Miami University

School of Art
University of Oklahoma

Department of Art
University of Tulsa

School of Architecture and Allied Arts
University of Oregon

Art Department
Portland State University

Department of the History of Art
Bryn Mawr College

Department of Art
Edinboro State College

Tyler School of Art of Temple University

Department of Fine Arts
University of Pennsylvania

Department of Painting and Sculpture
Carnegie-Mellon University

Department of Fine Arts
University of Pittsburgh

Department of Studio Arts
University of Pittsburgh

ART Continued

Department of Art History
Pennsylvania State University

Art Department
Brown University

Rhode Island School of Design @ Providence

Department of History and Visual Studies
Clemson University

Department of Art
University of South Carolina

Art Department
East Tennessee State University

Department of Art
University of Tennessee

Department of Related Art, Crafts, and Interior Design
University of Tennessee

Art Department
Memphis State University

Art Department
East Texas State University

Division of Fine Arts
Southern Methodist University

Art Department
North Texas State University

Art Department
Texas Christian University

Department of Art
University of Houston

Department of Art
Texas Tech University

Department of Art
Stephen F. Austin State University

Department of Art
Utah State University

Department of Art & Design
Brigham Young University

School of Art
Bowling Green State University

Department of Art
Pennsylvania State University

Department of Art
University of Utah

American Conservatory of Music @ Chicago

Department of Music
Arizona State University

Division of Music
Arkansas State University

Department of Music
Austin Peay State University

School of Music
Ball State University

School of Music
Baylor University

Boston Conservatory of Music

School of Music
Boston University

College of Musical Arts
Bowling Green State University

School of Music
Bradley University

Department of Music
Brigham Young University

Department of Music
Case Western Reserve University

School of Music
Catholic University of America

Department of Music
Central Michigan University

Chicago Conservatory College

Chicago Musical College of Roosevelt University

Cleveland Institute of Music

Department of Music
Cleveland State University

Department of Music
Colorado State University

School of Music
De Paul University

College of Fine Arts
Drake University

School of Music
Duquesne University

School of Music
East Carolina University

Department of Music
East Texas State University

School of Music
Eastern New Mexico University

Eastman School of Music
University of Rochester

School of Music
Florida State University

Department of Music
Fort Hays State University

School of Music
George Peabody College

School of Music
Hardin-Simmons University

Hartt College of Music
University of Hartford

Department of Music
College of Holy Names @ Oakland

Department of Music
Howard University

Department of Music
Illinois State University

School of Music
Indiana University

School of Music
Ithaca College

MUSIC Continued

Jordan College of Music of Butler University

Department of Music
Kansas State University

School of Music
Kent State University

School of Music
Lewis and Clark College

School of Music
Louisiana State University

Manhattan School of Music

Department of Music
Memphis State University

Music Department
Miami University

Department of Music
Michigan State University

Department of Music
Midwestern State University

Department of Music
Moorehead State University

New England Conservatory of Music @ Boston

Department of Music
New Mexico State University

Division of Music
New York University

School of Music
North Texas State University

School of Music
North East Louisiana University

Music Department
Northern Arizona University

School of Music
Northwestern University

Oberlin College Conservatory of Music

School of Music
Ohio State University

School of Music
Ohio University

School of Music
Ouachita Baptist University

Department of Music
Pacific Union College

Peabody Institute of Johns Hopkins University

Department of Music
Pittsburgh State University

St. Louis Conservatory of Music

Department of Music
Southeastern Louisiana University

Department of Music
Southern Illinois University @ Edwardsville

Division of Music
Southern Methodist University

Department of Music
State University College

The Crane School of Music
State University College

School of Music
Syracuse University

College of Music
Temple University

Department of Music
Texas Christian University

Department of Music
Texas Tech University

Department of Music
Tulane University

Division of Music
University of Alabama

MUSIC Continued

School of Music
University of Arizona

Department of Music
University of Arkansas

College-Conservatory of Music
University of Cincinnati

College of Music
University of Colorado

Department of Music
University of Connecticut

Department of Music
University of Georgia

Department of Music
University of Hawaii

School of Music
University of Idaho

School of Music
University of Illinois

School of Music
University of Iowa

School of Music
University of Kansas

School of Music
University of Kentucky

School of Music
University of Louisville

Department of Music
University of Maryland

Department of Music
University of Massachusetts

School of Music
University of Miami

School of Music
University of Michigan

Department of Music
University of Minnesota

Department of Music
University of Mississippi

Department of Music
University of Missouri

The Conservatory of Music
University of Missouri @ Kansas City

Department of Music
University of Montana

School of Music
University of Nebraska

Department of Music
University of New Mexico

School of Music
University of North Carolina

School of Music
University of Northern Colorado

School of Music
University of Oklahoma

School of Music
University of Oregon

School of Music
University of Puget Sound

School of Music
University of Redlands

Department of Music
University of South Carolina

School of Music
University of Southern California

Department of Music
University of South Dakota

Department of Music
University of Southern Mississippi

MUSIC Continued

School of Music
University of Houston

Music Department
University of Tennessee

Department of Music
University of Texas

Conservatory of Music
University of the Pacific

School of Music
University of Tulsa

Department of Music
University of Utah

School of Music
University of Washington

School of Music
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Department of Music
Virginia Commonwealth University

Department of Music
Washington University

Department of Music
Wayne State University

Department of Music
West Texas State University

Division of Music
West Virginia University

Department of Music
Western Kentucky University

Department of Music
Western Michigan University

School of Music
Wichita State University

School of Music
Winthrop College

Wisconsin Conservatory of Music, Inc.

School of Music
Yale University

The Dana School of Music
Youngstown State University

School of Music
University of Pittsburgh

Department of Music
Bryn Mawr College

School of Music
Rutgers University

Department of Music
Brown University

School of Music
University of Pennsylvania

School of Music
SUNY @ Buffalo

School of Music
Princeton University

School of Music
Harvard University

School of Music
University of Chicago

School of Music
Cornell University

School of Music
Columbia University

School of Music
Stanford University

School of Music
University of North Carolina

School of Music
Converse College

Department of Telecommunications
Indiana University

Department of Telecommunication
Michigan State University

Department of Radio-TV
Ohio University

Department of Radio-TV-Film
Temple University

Department of Drama
University of Georgia

Radio-TV-Film Department
University of Texas

Department of Speech Communication
Auburn University

Department of Broadcast & Film Communication
University of Alabama

Department of Radio-TV
Arkansas State University

Department of Speech & Dramatic Art
University of Arkansas

Department of Mass Communication
California State University

Department of Theatre Arts
Humboldt State University

Department of Communication Arts
Loyola Marymount University

Department of Communication
Pepperdine Univeristy

Department of Communication Studies
California State University

Department of Telecommunications & Film
San Diego State University

Department of Speech
University of California

Department of Speech & Theatre Arts
Colorado State University

Department of Communication
University of Colorado

Department of Mass Communication
University of Denver

Department of Corporate & Political Communication
Fairfield University

Department of Communication
University of Delaware

Department of Communication Arts & Sciences
Howard University

Department of Communication
Florida State University

Department of Information Sciences
Illinois State University

School of Speech
Northwestern University

Department of Communication & Theatre
University of Illinois @ Chicago Circle

Department of Communication Arts & Sciences
De Pauw University

Department of Speech
Indiana State University

Department of Communication
Purdue University

Department of Speech & Dramatic Art
University of Iowa

Department of Speech Communication
Fort Hays State University

Department of Speech Communication
Wichita State University

Department of Journalism & Radio-TV
Murray State University

RADIO & TELEVISION Continued

Department of Communication & Theatre
Western Kentucky University

Department of Speech
Louisiana State University

Department of Drama & Communication
University of New Orleans

Department of Speech
University of Southwestern Louisiana

Department of Speech & Dramatic Art
University of Maryland

Department of Communication Studies
University of Massachusetts

Department of Speech & Dramatic Arts
Central Michigan University

Department of Speech Communication and Theatre
University of Michigan

Department of Speech Communication, Theatre and Journalism
Wayne State University

Department of Communication Arts & Sciences
Western Michigan University

Department of Speech-Communication
University of Minnesota

Department of Speech & Theatre
University of Mississippi

Department of Speech & Dramatic Art
University of Missouri

Department of Speech Communication
Kearney State College

Department of Communicative Arts & Sciences
Eastern New Mexico University

Department of Speech Communication
University of New Mexico

Department of Cinema Studies
New York University

Department of Speech
University of North Dakota

Department of Speech Communication
Bowling Green State University

Department of Communication
Cleveland State University

Department of Speech
Kent State University

Department of Communication & Theatre
Miami University

Department of Speech Communication
Portland State University

Department of Speech
University of Oregon

Department of Creative & Communicative Arts
University of Portland

Department of Speech Communication
Pennsylvania State University

Department of Speech
South Dakota State University

Department of Communication
University of South Dakota

Department of Theatre & Communication Arts
Memphis State University

Department of Communication
Stephen F. Austin State University

Department of Communications
Texas Southern University

Department of Speech & Theatre
West Texas State University

Department of Communication
Utah State University

Department of Communication
University of Utah

Department of Communication
University of Vermont

RADIO & TELEVISION Continued

Department of Radio-TV
Kansas State University

Department of Radio-TV
University of Kansas

Department of Radio-TV
University of Kentucky

Department of Radio-TV
University of Montana

Department of Radio-TV
University of Nebraska

Department of Radio-TV
University of North Carolina

Department of Radio-TV
Ohio State University

Department of Radio-TV
Oklahoma State University

Department of Radio-TV
University of Oklahoma

Department of Radio-TV
University of South Carolina

Department of Radio-TV
North Texas State University

Department of Speech
Washington State University

Department of Speech
Marshall University

Department of Speech
Marquette University

Department of Communication Arts
University of Wisconsin

Department of Speech
University of Wisconsin

Department of Journalism & Telecommunication
University of Wyoming

Department of Radio-TV
University of Tennessee

Department of Radio-TV
Boston University

Department of Radio-TV
Syracuse University

Department of Radio-TV
University of California @ Los Angeles

Department of Radio-TV
San Francisco State University

Department of Radio-TV
Stanford University

Department of Radio-TV
University of Florida

Department of Radio-TV
University of Illinois

Department of Radio-TV
University of Illinois

Department of Radio-TV
Western Illinois University

Department of Radio-TV
Ball State University

Department of Radio-TV
Iowa State University

Department of Theatre
Florida State University

Department of Drama
University of Michigan

Department of Comm Arts & Sciences
New York University

Department of Theatre
University of Illinois

School of Speech, Theatre Division
Northwestern University

Department of Theatre
Ohio State University

Department of Theatre
Ohio University

Department of Drama
University of Oklahoma

Department of Theatre
Purdue University

Department of Drama
University of Southern California

Department of Theatre & Dance
University of Colorado

Department of Theatre
University of Denver

Department of Theatre
University of Florida

Department of Speech & Dramatic Art
University of Iowa

Department of Theatre Arts
University of Minnesota

Department of Speech & Dramatic Art
University of Missouri

Department of Speech
University of Oregon

Department of Speech & Theatre Arts
University of Pittsburgh

Department of Drama
University of Washington

Department of Speech
Washington State University

Department of Theatre
Wayne State University

Department of Speech Comm. & Theatre Arts
University of Alabama

Department of Theatre
University of Montevallo

Department of Theatre
United States International University

Department of Theatre
Stanford University

Dramatic Arts Department
University of California @ Berkeley

Department of Drama
University of California @ Irvine

Department of Drama
University of California @ La Jolla

Department of Theatre
University of California @ Santa Barbara

Department of Dramatic Arts
University of Connecticut

Department of Speech & Drama
George Washington University

Department of Drama & Theatre
University of Georgia

Department of Drama & Theatre
University of Hawaii

Theatre Arts Department
University of Idaho

THEATER Continued

Department of Theatre
Illinois State University

Department of Drama
Indiana University

Theatre Arts Department
Drake University

Department of Speech & Drama
University of Kansas

Department of Drama & Communication
University of New Orleans

Theatre Arts Department
Boston University

Department of Drama
Tufts University

Theatre Department
Michigan State University

Department of Speech & Theatre
University of Mississippi

Department of Fine Arts
University of Southern Mississippi

Department of Theatre Arts
Rutgers University

Department of Theatre Arts
Columbia University

Department of Theatre
Pratt Institute

Department of Theatre
Teachers College

Department of Dramatic Art
University of North Carolina @Chapel Hill

Department of Drama & Speech
University of North Carolina @ Greensboro

Department of Speech Communication
Bowling Green State University

Theatre, Drama, Dance Department
Case Western Reserve University

School of Speech, Theatre Division
Kent State University

Department of Drama
Carnegie-Mellon University

Department of Theatre & Film
Pennsylvania State University

Department of Theatre
Brown University

Speech & Drama Department
North Texas State University

Theatre Department
Southern Methodist University

Department of Theatre Arts
Texas Christian University

Department of Speech & Drama
Texas Southern University

Theatre & Cinematic Arts
Brigham Young University

Department of Theatre
University of Utah

Department of Drama
University of Virginia

Division of Drama
West Virginia University

Department of Theatre & Drama
University of Wisconsin

Department of Theatre
City University of New York-Graduate Center

Theatre Department
Cornell University

Theatre Department
University of Nebraska

Theatre Department
Yale University

Theatre Department
University of Arizona

THEATER Continued

Theatre Department
University of Miami

Theatre Department
Louisiana State University

Theatre Department
Tulane University

Theatre Department
University of Montana

Theatre Department
Utah State University

Theatre Department
Virginia Commonwealth University

SPEECH PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY

Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology
University of Iowa

Department of Audiology & Speech Pathology
University of Tennessee

Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology
University of Virginia

Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology
West Virginia University

Department of Speech
University of California @ Santa Barbara

Program in Communication Disorders
University of Denver

Department of Communication Arts & Sciences
Howard University

Department of Habilitative Sciences
Florida State University

Department of Speech
University of Florida

Department of Communicative Disorders
Northwestern University

Speech & Hearing Clinic
Louisiana State University

Speech & Hearing Program
Adelphi University

Program in Speech Pathology and Audiology
The City University of New York

Speech and Hearing Center
Indiana University

Department of Audiology & Speech Sciences
Michigan State University

Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology
New York University

School of Hearing & Speech Sciences
Ohio University

SPEECH PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY Continued

Program in Speech Pathology & Audiology
Washington University

Speech & Hearing Clinic
University of Nebraska

Speech Department
Brooklyn College

Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology
Columbia University

Speech Communication Department
SUNY @ Buffalo

Department of Audiology & Speech Pathology
Syracuse University

Division of Audiology & Speech Pathology
John Hopkins University

Division of Speech & Hearing Science
University of Maryland

Department of Communicative Disorders
University of Wisconsin

Speech & Hearing Center
Wayne State University

Department of Audiology
Wayne State University

Department of Speech Communication
Case Western University

Department of Speech
Ohio State University

Speech & Hearing Laboratory
University of Cincinnati

Department of Communication Disorders
University of Oklahoma Graduate College

Department of Speech
University of Oregon

Department of Speech
Temple University

Department of Speech & Theatre Arts
University of Pittsburgh

SPEECH PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY Continued

Department of Audiology & Speech Sciences
Purdue University

Speech & Hearing Sciences
Stanford Medical Center

Speech Pathology & Audiology Area
University of Georgia

Program in Speech
University of Minnesota

Department of Speech & Dramatic Art
University of Missouri

Speech Pathology & Audiology Department
Bowling Green State University

Division of Speech Pathology & Audiology
Kent State University

Department of Speech
Univeristy of Texas

Program in Communicative Disorders
University of Southern California

Speech & Hearing Clinic
University of Colorado

Department of Speech
University of Connecticut

Department of Logopedics
Wichita State University

Department of Speech & Drama
University of Kansas

Department of Special Education
University of Kentucky

Speech & Hearing Science Department
University of Illinois

Department of Communication Disorders
Boston University

Speech Clinic
University of Michigan

SPEECH PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY

Division of Audiology
University of Pittsburgh

Division of Audiology & Speech Pathology
Vanderbilt University

Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology
University of Utah

Department of Speech
University of Washington

Speech & Hearing Clinic
Pennsylvania State University

Department of Speech & Hearing Science
University of Southern Mississippi

SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Department of Speech Communication
Bowling Green State University

Department of Communication
Florida State University

Department of Communication Arts & Sciences
Howard University

Department of Speech Communication
Indiana University

Department of Speech Communication & Theatre
University of Michigan

Department of Communication
Michigan State University

Department of Speech
Kent State Univeristy

Department of Speech
Louisiana State University

School of Communications
University of Illinois

Department of Speech Communication
University of Illinois

School of Speech
Northwestern University

School of Interpersonal Communication
Ohio University

Department of Speech Communication
Oklahoma State University

Department of Communication
University of Oklahoma

Department of Speech Communication
Pennsylvania State University

Department of Communication
Purdue University

Department of Language, Literature, & Communication
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

SPEECH COMMUNICATION Continued

Department of Communication
SUNY @ Buffalo

Department of Speech
Temple University

Department of Speech Communication
University of Arizona

Department of Rhetoric
University of California @ Berkeley

Annenberg School of Communications
University of Southern California

Department of Speech Communication
University of Southern California

Department of Communication
University of Colorado

Department of Speech Communication
University of Denver

Department of Speech
University of Florida

Department of Speech & Dramatic Art
University of Iowa

Department of Communication Studies
University of Massachusetts

Department of Speech Communication
University of Minnesota

Department of Speech & Dramatic Art
University of Missouri

Department of Speech Communication
University of Nebraska

Department of Speech Communication
University of North Carolina

Department of Speech
University of Oregon

Department of Speech & Theatre Arts
University of Pittsburgh

SPEECH COMMUNICATION Continued

Department of Speech Communication
University of Texas

Department of Communication
University of Utah

Department of Speech Communication
University of Washington

Department of Communication Arts
University of Wisconsin

Department of Speech
Washington State University

Department of Speech Communication
Wayne State University

Department of Speech & Drama
University of Kansas

Department of Speech Communication & Drama
North Texas State University

Department of Speech Communication
West Virginia University

CINEMA

Cinema Department
University of Southern California

Radio, T.V., and Film Department
Northwestern University

Art Department
University of New Mexico

Film Department
Pratt Institute

Graphic Arts & Photography Department
Rochester Institute of Technology

State University of New York @ Buffalo

Art Department
State University of New York @ New Paltz

Public Communication Department
Syracuse University

Visual and Performing Arts Department
Syracuse University

Cinema and Photography Department
Ohio State University

Art Department
Ohio University

Art Department
Arizona State University

Department of Cinema & Photography
University of California @ Los Angeles

Cinema Department
New York University

Audio Visual Department
University of Minnesota

Motion Picture Department
University of Michigan

Art Department
University of Iowa

Cinema Department
University of Illinois

CINEMA Continued

Fine Arts Department
University of Arizona

Film and Theatre Department
Pennsylvania State University

Film-Radio-Television Department
Temple University

Media Department
Temple University

Communication Arts Department
University of Wisconsin @ Madison

Art Department
New York University

Motion Picture Department
San Francisco State University

Department of Instructional Design
University of Iowa

Journalism Department
University of Iowa

Art Department @ Columbus

STILL PHOTOGRAPHY

Art Department
Arizona State University

School of Art
California Institute of the Arts

Photography Department
University of California @ Los Angeles

Fine Arts Department
University of Southern California

Photography Department
Northwestern University

Art Department
University of New Mexico

Photography Department
Pratt Institute

Graphic Arts & Photography Department
Rochester Institute of Technology

Photography Department
State University of New York @ Buffalo

Art Department
State University of New York @ New Paltz

Public Communication Department
Syracuse University

Visual & Performing Arts Department
Syracuse University

Cinema & Photography Department
Ohio State University

Art Department
Ohio University

Photography Department
School of the Art Institute of Chicago

Art & Photography
University of Illinois

Art Department
University of Iowa

STILL PHOTOGRAPHY Continued

Instructional Design Department
University of Iowa

Journalism Department
University of Iowa

Art Department
University of Michigan

Audiovisual Department
University of Minnesota

Photography Department
University of Wisconsin @ Madison

Media Department
Temple University

Fine Arts Department
University of Arizona

JOURNALISM

School of Journalism
Southern California University

Department of Communications
Stanford University

Department of Journalism
Howard University

College of Communications
University of Illinois

School of Journalism
Indiana University

School of Journalism
Iowa University

School of Journalism
Michigan State University

Department of Journalism
University of Michigan

School of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Minnesota

Department of Journalism
University of Southern Mississippi

School of Journalism
University of Missouri

School of Public Communications
Syracuse University

School of Journalism
University of North Carolina

School of Journalism
Ohio State University

School of Journalism
Ohio University

School of Journalism and Broadcasting
Oklahoma State University

Department of Journalism
Temple University

JOURNALISM Continued

School of Journalism
University of Tennessee

Department of Journalism
University of Texas @ Austin

Department of Communication
University of Utah

School of Communications
University of Washington

School of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Wisconsin @ Madison

Appendix C

Phase I Response Forms

ART

Instructions: Part 1

Part 1 of the response form is to be used to indicate the number of individuals receiving MFA or Doctorate degrees from your academic unit over the last ten (10) years. The response form classifies individuals by sex, race, and major area of interest.

Please indicate the number of individuals receiving the appropriate degree during the appropriate period for each category on the following tables. Report all individuals who have completed the degree program and received the degree. Individuals who do not fit in one of the curricular divisions should be counted in the appropriate "other" or "do not know" category. The curricular divisions, however, should be used as much as possible. Each individual should be counted only once.

MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	STUDIO ART	ART HISTORY	ART EDUCATION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	STUDIO ART	ART HISTORY	ART EDUCATION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--1969-1973

SEX	RACE	STUDIO ART	ART HISTORY	ART EDUCATION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

3

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--1974-1979

SEX	RACE	STUDIO ART	ART HISTORY	ART EDUCATION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

4

Instructions: Part 2

Part 2 of the response form is to be used to classify individuals presently enrolled in MFA or Doctorate degree programs within your academic unit.

Present MFA Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	STUDIO ART	ART HISTORY	ART EDUCATION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

Present DOCTORATE Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	STUDIO ART	ART HISTORY	ART EDUCATION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

Instructions: Part 3

Part 3 of the response form is to be used to estimate the number of individuals you expect to graduate with MFA or Doctorate degrees within the next two (2) years.

Expected MFA Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	STUDIO ART	ART HISTORY	ART EDUCATION	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

Expected DOCTORATE Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	STUDIO ART	ART HISTORY	ART EDUCATION	OTHER
MALE	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

Part 4: 6

1. Does your academic unit currently have affirmative action goals for the recruitment of:

	(Circle One)	
a. Faculty	YES	NO
b. Graduate Students	YES	NO

2. If YES, state those goals.

3. If NO, is there a likelihood of establishing affirmative action goals in the near future? (Circle One) YES NO

4. If YES, at this time, can you estimate what they will be?

5. Please rate the difficulty of this response form.

(Circle One)

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	slightly difficult	moderately difficult	very difficult	extremely difficult

6. Do you feel the results of this study may be of benefit to your academic unit in establishing or meeting affirmative action guidelines? (Circle One) YES NO

7. If YES, indicate your name and address below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Instructions: Part 1

Part 1 of the response form is to be used to indicate the number of individuals receiving MFA, MM, MME, or Doctorate degrees from your academic unit over the last ten (10) years. The response form classifies individuals by sex, race, and major area of interest.

Please indicate the number of individuals receiving the appropriate degree during the appropriate period for each category on the following tables. Report all individuals who have completed the degree program and received the degree. Individuals who do not fit in one of the curricular divisions should be counted in the appropriate "other" or "do not know" category. The curricular divisions, however, should be used as much as possible. Each individual should be counted only once.

MFA, MM, & MME Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	PERFORMANCE	THEORY/ COMPOSITION	HISTORY/ LITERATURE	MUSIC BUSINESS	MUSIC EDUCATION	OPERA/ THEATRE	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
FEMALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								

189

MFA, MM, & MME Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	PERFORMANCE	THEORY/ COMPOSITION	HISTORY/ LITERATURE	MUSIC BUSINESS	MUSIC EDUCATION	OPERA/ THEATRE	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
FEMALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	PERFORMANCE	THEORY/ COMPOSITION	HISTORY/ LITERATURE	MUSIC BUSINESS	MUSIC EDUCATION	OPERA/ THEATRE	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
FEMALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979 4

SEX	RACE	PERFORMANCE	THEORY/ COMPOSITION	HISTORY/ LITERATURE	MUSIC BUSINESS	MUSIC EDUCATION	OPERA/ THEATRE	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
FEMALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								

Instructions: Part 2

5

Part 2 of the response form is to be used to classify individuals presently enrolled in MFA, MM, MME, or Doctorate degree programs within your academic unit.

Present MFA, MM, & MME Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	PERFORMANCE	THEORY/ COMPOSITION	HISTORY/ LITERATURE	MUSIC BUSINESS	MUSIC EDUCATION	OPERA/ THEATRE	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
FEMALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								

Present DOCTORATE Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	PERFORMANCE	THEORY/ COMPOSITION	HISTORY/ LITERATURE	MUSIC BUSINESS	MUSIC EDUCATION	OPERA/ THEATRE	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
FEMALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								

Instructions: Part 3

Part 3 of the response form is to be used to estimate the number of individuals you expect to graduate with MFA, MM, MME, or Doctorate degrees within the next two (2) years.

Expected MFA, MM, & MME Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	PERFORMANCE	THEORY/ COMPOSITION	HISTORY/ LITERATURE	MUSIC BUSINESS	MUSIC EDUCATION	OPERA/ THEATRE	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
FEMALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							

Expected DOCTORATE Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	PERFORMANCE	THEORY/ COMPOSITION	HISTORY/ LITERATURE	MUSIC BUSINESS	MUSIC EDUCATION	OPERA/ THEATRE	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
FEMALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							

Part 4: 7

1. Does your academic unit currently have affirmative action goals for the recruitment of:

	(Circle One)	
a. Faculty	YES	NO
b. Graduate Students	YES	NO

2. If YES, state those goals.

3. If NO, is there a likelihood of establishing affirmative action goals in the near future? (Circle One) YES NO

4. If YES, at this time, can you estimate what they will be?

5. Please rate the difficulty of this response form.

(Circle One)

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	slightly difficult	moderately difficult	very difficult	extremely difficult

6. Do you feel the results of this study may be of benefit to your academic unit in establishing or meeting affirmative action guidelines? (Circle One) YES NO

7. If YES, indicate your name and address below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Instructions: Part 1

Part 1 of the response form is to be used to indicate the number of individuals receiving Masters or Doctorate degrees from your academic unit over the last ten (10) years. The response form classifies individuals by sex, race, and major area of interest.

Please indicate the number of individuals receiving the appropriate degree during the appropriate period for each category on the following tables. Report all individuals who have completed the degree program and received the degree. Individuals who do not fit in one of the curricular divisions should be counted in the appropriate "other" or "do not know" category. The curricular divisions, however, should be used as much as possible. Each individual should be counted only once.

MASTERS Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	R&T -PRODUCTION	GRAPHICS/ LIGHTING	PERFORMANCE/ PROGRAMMING	R&T WRITING COPYWRITING	SALES & MANAGEMENT	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
FEMALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							

MASTERS Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	R&T PRODUCTION	GRAPHICS/ LIGHTING	PERFORMANCE/ PROGRAMMING	R&T WRITING COPYWRITING	SALES & MANAGEMENT	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
FEMALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							

2

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	R&T -PRODUCTION	GRAPHICS/ LIGHTING	PERFORMANCE/ PROGRAMMING	R&T WRITING COPYWRITING	SALES & MANAGEMENT	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
FEMALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							

3

199

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	R&T PRODUCTION	GRAPHICS/ LIGHTING	PERFORMANCE/ PROGRAMMING	R&T WRITING COPYWRITING	SALES & MANAGEMENT	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
FEMALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							

Instructions: Part 2

Part 2 of the response form is to be used to classify individuals presently enrolled in Masters or Doctorate degree programs within your academic unit.

Present MASTERS Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	R&T PRODUCTION	GRAPHICS/ LIGHTING	PERFORMANCE PROGRAMMING	R&T WRITING COPYWRITING	SALES & MANAGEMENT	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
FEMALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							

Present DOCTORATE DEGREE Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	R&T PRODUCTION	GRAPHICS/ LIGHTING	PERFORMANCE PROGRAMMING	R&T WRITING COPYWRITING	SALES & MANAGEMENT	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							
FEMALE:	Majority (White)							
	Minority							
	Do Not Know Race							

Instructions: Part 3

Part 3 of the response form is to be used to estimate the number of individuals you expect to graduate with Masters or Doctorate degrees within the next two (2) years.

Expected MASTERS Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	R&T PRODUCTION	GRAPHICS/ LIGHTING	PERFORMANCE PROGRAMMING	R&T WRITING COPYWRITING	SALES & MANAGEMENT	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
FEMALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						

Expected DOCTORATE Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	R&T PRODUCTION	GRAPHICS/ LIGHTING	PERFORMANCE PROGRAMMING	R&T WRITING COPYWRITING	SALES & MANAGEMENT	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
FEMALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						

Part 4: 7

1. Does your academic unit currently have affirmative action goals for the recruitment of:

(Circle One)

a. Faculty YES NO
b. Graduate Students YES NO

2. If YES, state those goals.

3. If NO, is there a likelihood of establishing affirmative action goals in the near future? (Circle One) YES NO

4. If YES, at this time, can you estimate what they will be?

5. Please rate the difficulty of this response form.

(Circle One)

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	slightly difficult	moderately difficult	very difficult	extremely difficult

6. Do you feel the results of this study may be of benefit to your academic unit in establishing or meeting affirmative action guidelines? (Circle One) YES NO

7. If YES, indicate your name and address below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

THEATRE

Instructions: Part 1

Part 1 of the response form is to be used to indicate the number of individuals receiving MFA or Doctorate degrees from your academic unit over the last (10) years. The response form classifies individuals by sex, race, and major area of interest.

Please indicate the number of individuals receiving the appropriate degree during the appropriate period for each category on the following tables. Report all individuals who have completed the degree program and received the degree. Individuals who do not fit in one of the curricular divisions should be counted in the appropriate "other" or "do not know" category. The curricular divisions, however, should be used as much as possible. Each individual should be counted only once.

MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	ACTING/ DIRECTING	DESIGN/ TECHNICAL	WRITING/ DRAMA LIT	HISTORY/ CRITICISM	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
FEMALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						

MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	ACTING/ DIRECTING	DESIGN/ TECHNICAL	WRITING/ DRAMA LIT	HISTORY/ CRITICISM	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
FEMALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						

Doctorate Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	ACTING/ DIRECTING	DESIGN/ TECHNICAL	WRITING/ DRAMA LIT	HISTORY/ CRITICISM	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
FEMALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	ACTING/ DIRECTING	DESIGN/ TECHNICAL	WRITING/ DRAMA LIT	HISTORY/ CRITICISM	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
FEMALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						

Instructions: Part 2 4

Part 2 of the response form is to be used to classify individuals presently enrolled in MFA or Doctorate degree programs within your academic unit.

Present MFA Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	ACTING/ DIRECTING	DESIGN/ TECHNICAL	WRITING/ DRAMA LIT	HISTORY/ CRITICISM	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
FEMALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						

Present DOCTORATE Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	ACTING/ DIRECTING	DESIGN/ TECHNICAL	WRITING/ DRAMA LIT	HISTORY/ CRITICISM	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						
FEMALE:	Majority (White)						
	Minority						
	Do Not Know Race						

Instructions: Part 3 5

Part 3 of the response form is to be used to estimate the number of individuals you expect to graduate with MFA or Doctorate degrees within the next two (2) years.

Expected MFA Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	ACTING/ DIRECTING	DESIGN/ TECHNICAL	WRITING/ DRAMA LIT	HSITORY/ CRITICISM	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

Expected DOCTORATE Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	ACTING/ DIRECTING	DESIGN/ TECHNICAL	WRITING/ DRAMA LIT	HISTORY/ CRITICISM	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

Part 4:

1. Does your academic unit currently have affirmative action goals for the recruitment of:

	(Circle One)	
a. Faculty	YES	NO
b. Graduate Students	YES	NO

2. If YES, state those goals.

3. If NO, is there a likelihood of establishing affirmative action goals in the near future? (Circle One) YES NO

4. If YES, at this time, can you estimate what they will be?

5. Please rate the difficulty of this response form.

(Circle One)

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	slightly difficult	moderately difficult	very difficult	extremely difficult

6. Do you feel the results of this study may be of benefit to your academic unit in establishing or meeting affirmative action guidelines? (Circle One) YES NO

7. If YES, indicate your name and address below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

SPEECH PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY

Instructions: Part 1

Part 1 of the response form is to be used to indicate the number of individuals receiving Doctorate degrees from your academic unit over the last ten (10) years. The response form classifies individuals by sex, race, and major area of interest.

Please indicate the number of individuals receiving the Doctorate degree during the appropriate period for each category on the following tables. Report all individuals who have completed the degree program and received the degree. Individuals who do not fit in one of the curricular divisions should be counted in the appropriate "other" or "do not know" category. The curricular divisions, however, should be used as much as possible. Each individual should be counted only once.

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	SPEECH DIAGNOSTICS	PHONOLOGY	LANGUAGE	FLUENCY-STUTTERING	VOICE	AUDIOLOGY DIAGNOSTICS	AUDIOLOGY DISORDERS	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)									
	Minority									
	Do Not Know Race									
FEMALE:	Majority (White)									
	Minority									
	Do Not Know Race									
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White									
	Minority									
	Do Not Know Race									

211

2

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	SPEECH DIAGNOSTICS	PHONOLOGY	LANGUAGE	FLUENCY-STUTTERING	VOICE	AUDIOLOGY DIAGNOSTICS	AUDIOLOGY DISORDERS	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)									
	Minority									
	Do Not Know Race									
FEMALE:	Majority (White)									
	Minority									
	Do Not Know Race									
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)									
	Minority									
	Do Not Know Race									

Instructions: Part 2

Part 2 of the response form is to be used to classify individuals presently enrolled in Doctorate degree programs within your academic unit.

Present DOCTORATE Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	SPEECH DIAGNOSTICS	PHENELOGY	LANGUAGE	FLUENCY-STUTTERING	VOICE	AUDIOLOGY DIAGNOSTICS	AUDIOLOGY DISORDERS	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)									
	Minority									
	Do Not Know Race									
FEMALE:	Majority (White)									
	Minority									
	Do Not Know Race									

213

Instructions: Part 3

Part 3 of the response form is to be used to estimate the number of individuals you expect to graduate with Doctorate degrees within the next two (2) years.

Expected DOCTORATE Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	SPEECH DIAGNOSTICS	PHONOLOGY	LANGUAGE	FLUENCY-STUTTERING	VOICE	AUDIOLOGY DIAGNOSTICS	AUDIOLOGY DISORDERS	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								
FEMALE:	Majority (White)								
	Minority								
	Do Not Know Race								

Part 4:

1. Does your academic unit currently have affirmative action goals for the recruitment of:

	(Circle One)	
a. Faculty	YES	NO
b. Graduate Students	YES	NO

2. If YES, state those goals.

3. If NO, is there a likelihood of establishing affirmative action goals in the near future? (Circle One) YES NO

4. If YES, at this time, can you estimate what they will be?

5. Please rate the difficulty of this response form.

(Circle One)

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	slightly difficult	moderately difficult	very difficult	extremely difficult

6. Do you feel the results of this study may be of benefit to your academic unit in establishing or meeting affirmative action guidelines? (Circle One) YES NO

7. If YES, indicate your name and address below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Instructions: Part 1

Part 1 of the response form is to be used to indicate the number of individuals receiving Doctorate degrees from your academic unit over the last ten (10) years. The response form classifies individuals by sex, race, and major area of interest.

Please indicate the number of individuals receiving the Doctorate degree during the appropriate period for each category on the following tables. Report all individuals who have completed the degree program and received the degree. Individuals who do not fit in one of the curricular divisions should be counted in the appropriate "other" or "do not know" category. The curricular divisions, however, should be used as much as possible. Each individual should be counted only once.

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients --Years 1969-1973 SEX / RACE	THEATRE/ ORAL INTERP	RHETORIC/ PUBLIC ADDRESS	COMM THEORY	INTERCULTURAL COMM	INTERPERSONAL COMM	COMM EDUCATION	COMM SKILLS	ORGANIZATIONAL COMM	MASS COMM/ POLITICAL	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE: Majority (White)											
Minority											
Do Not Know Race											
FEMALE: Majority (White)											
Minority											
Do Not Know Race											
DO NOT KNOW SEX: Majority (White)											
Minority											
Do Not Know Race											

2

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	THEATRE/ ORAL INTERP	RHETORIC/ PUBLIC ADDRESS	COMM THEORY	INTERCULTURAL COMM	INTERPERSONAL COMM	COMM EDUCATION	COMM SKILLS	ORGANIZATIONAL COMM	MASS COMM/ POLITICAL	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)											
	Minority											
	Do Not Know Race											
FEMALE:	Majority (White)											
	Minority											
	Do Not Know Race											
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)											
	Minority											
	Do Not Know Race											

Instructions: Part 2

Part 2 of the response form is to be used to classify individuals presently enrolled in Doctorate degree programs within your academic unit.

Present DOCTORATE Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	THEATRE/ DRAMA INTERP	RHETORIC/ PUBLIC ADDRESS	COMM THEORY	INTERCULTURAL COMM	INTERPERSONAL COMM	COMM EDUCATION	COMM SKILLS	ORGANIZATIONAL COMM	MASS COMM/ POLITICAL	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)											
	Minority											
	Do Not Know Race											
FEMALE:	Majority (White)											
	Minority											
	Do Not Know Race											

Instructions: Part 3

Part 3 of the response form is to be used to estimate the number of individuals you expect to graduate with Doctorate degrees within the next two (2) years.

Expected DOCTORATE Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	THEATRE/ ORAL INTERP	RHETORIC/ PUBLIC ADDRESS	COMM THEORY	INTERCULTURAL COMM	INTERPERSONAL COMM	COMM EDUCATION	COMM SKILLS	ORGANIZATIONAL COMM	MASS COMM/ POLITICAL	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)										
	Minority										
	Do Not Know Race										
FEMALE:	Majority (White)										
	Minority										
	Do Not Know Race										

5

Part 4:

1. Does your academic unit currently have affirmative action goals for the recruitment of: (Circle One)

a. Faculty	YES	NO
b. Graduate Students	YES	NO

2. If YES, state those goals.

3. If NO, is there a likelihood of establishing affirmative action goals in the near future? (Circle One) YES NO

4. If YES, at this time, can you estimate what they will be?

5. Please rate the difficulty of this response form.

(Circle One)

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	slightly difficult	moderately difficult	very difficult	extremely difficult

6. Do you feel the results of this study may be of benefit to your academic unit in establishing or meeting affirmative action guidelines? (Circle One) YES NO

7. If YES, indicate your name and address below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

CINEMA

Instructions: Part 1

Part 1 of the response form is to be used to indicate the number of individuals receiving MFA or Doctorate degrees in Cinema from your academic unit over the last ten (10) years. The response form classifies individuals by sex, race, and major area of interest.

Please indicate the number of individuals receiving the appropriate degree during the appropriate period for each category on the following tables. Report all individuals who have completed the degree program and received the degree in Cinema. Individuals who do not fit in one of the curricular divisions should be counted in the appropriate "other" or "do not know" category. The curricular divisions, however, should be used as much as possible. Each individual should be counted only once.

MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	FILM HISTORY & THEORY	FILM PRODUCTION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

2

MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	FILM HISTORY & THEORY	FILM PRODUCTION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

3

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	FILM HISTORY & THEORY	FILM PRODUCTION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

4

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	FILM HISTORY & THEORY	FILM PRODUCTION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

Instructions: Part 2 5

Part 2 of the response form is to be used to classify individuals presently enrolled in Cinema MFA or Doctorate degree programs within your academic unit.

Present MFA Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	FILM HISTORY & THEORY	FILM PRODUCTION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

6

Present DOCTORATE Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	FILM HISTORY & THEORY	FILM PRODUCTION	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

Instructions: Part 3 7

Part 3 of the response form is to be used to estimate the number of individuals you expect to graduate with MFA or Doctorate degrees in Cinema within the next two (2) years.

Expected MFA Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	FILM HISTORY & THEORY	FILM PRODUCTION	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)			
	Minority			
	Do Not Know Race			
FEMALE:	Majority (White)			
	Minority			
	Do Not Know Race			

Expected DOCTORATE Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	FILM HISTORY & THEORY	FILM PRODUCTION	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)			
	Minority			
	Do Not Know Race			
FEMALE:	Majority (White)			
	Minority			
	Do Not Know Race			

Part 4:

1. Does your academic unit currently have affirmative action goals for the recruitment of:

	(Circle One)	
a. Faculty	YES	NO
b. Graduate Students	YES	NO

2. If YES, state those goals.

3. If NO, is there a likelihood of establishing affirmative action goals in the near future? (Circle One) YES NO

4. If YES, at this time, can you estimate what they will be?

5. Please rate the difficulty of this response form.

(Circle One)

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	slightly difficult	moderately difficult	very difficult	extremely difficult

6. Do you feel the results of this study may be of benefit to your academic unit in establishing or meeting affirmative action guidelines? (Circle One) YES NO

7. If YES, indicate your name and address below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

STILL PHOTOGRAPHY

Instructions: Part 1

Part 1 of the response form is to be used to indicate the number of individuals receiving MFA or Doctorate degrees in Still Photography from your academic unit over the last ten (10) years. The response form classifies individuals by sex, race, and major area of interest.

Please indicate the number of individuals receiving the appropriate degree during the appropriate period for each category on the following tables. Report all individuals who have completed the degree program and received the degree in Still Photography. Individuals who do not fit in one of the curricular divisions should be counted in the appropriate "other" or "do not know" category. The curricular divisions, however, should be used as much as possible. Each individual should be counted only once.

MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	FINE ARTS PHOTOGRAPHY	PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY	HISTORY OF PHOTOGRAPHY	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

MFA Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	FINE ARTS PHOTOGRAPHY	PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY	HISTORY OF PHOTOGRAPHY	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

3

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	FINE ARTS PHOTOGRAPHY	PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY	HISTORY OF PHOTOGRAPHY	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

4

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	FINE ARTS PHOTOGRAPHY	PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY	HISTORY OF PHOTOGRAPHY	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

Instructions: Part 2 5

Part 2 of the response form is to be used to classify individuals presently enrolled in Still Photography MFA or Doctorate degree programs within your academic unit.

Present MFA Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	FINE ARTS PHOTOGRAPHY	PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY	HISTORY OF PHOTOGRAPHY	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

Present DOCTORATE Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	FINE ARTS PHOTOGRAPHY	PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY	HISTORY OF PHOTOGRAPHY	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

Instructions: Part 3 6

Part 3 of the response form is to be used to estimate the number of individuals you expect to graduate with MFA or Doctorate degrees in Still Photography within the next two (2) years.

Expected MFA Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	FINE ARTS PHOTOGRAPHY	PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY	HISTORY OF PHOTOGRAPHY	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

Expected DOCTORATE Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	FINE ARTS PHOTOGRAPHY	PROFESSIONAL PHOTOGRAPHY	HISTORY OF PHOTOGRAPHY	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

Part 4:

1. Does your academic unit currently have affirmative action goals for the recruitment of:

	(Circle One)	
a. Faculty	YES	NO
b. Graduate Students	YES	NO

2. If YES, state those goals.

3. If NO, is there a likelihood of establishing affirmative action goals in the near future? (Circle One) YES NO

4. If YES, at this time, can you estimate what they will be?

5. Please rate the difficulty of this response form.

(Circle One)

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	slightly difficult	moderately difficult	very difficult	extremely difficult

6. Do you feel the results of this study may be of benefit to your academic unit in establishing or meeting affirmative action guidelines? (Circle One) YES NO

7. If YES, indicate your name and address below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

JOURNALISM

Instructions: Part 1

Part 1 of the response form is to be used to indicate the number of individuals receiving Doctorate degrees from your academic unit over the last ten (10) years. The response form classifies individuals by sex, race, and major area of interest.

Please indicate the number of individuals receiving the Doctorate degree during the appropriate period for each category on the following tables. Report all individuals who have completed the degree program and received the degree. Individuals who do not fit in one of the curricular divisions, however, should be counted in the appropriate "other" or "do not know" category. The curricular divisions, however, should be used as much as possible. Each individual should be counted only once.

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1969-1973

SEX	RACE	NEWS/ EDITORIAL	ADVERTISING	MASS MEDIA	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

DOCTORATE Degree Recipients--Years 1974-1979

SEX	RACE	NEWS/ EDITORIAL	ADVERTISING	MASS MEDIA	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
DO NOT KNOW SEX:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

Instructions: Part 2

Part 2 of the response form is to be used to classify individuals presently enrolled in Doctorate degree programs within your academic unit.

Present DOCTORATE Degree Student Enrollment

SEX	RACE	NEWS/ EDITORIAL	ADVERTISING	MASS MEDIA	OTHER	DO NOT KNOW
MALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					
FEMALE:	Majority (White)					
	Minority					
	Do Not Know Race					

Instructions: Part 3

Part 3 of the response form is to be used to estimate the number of individuals you expect to graduate with Doctorate degrees within the next two (2) years.

Expected DOCTORATE Degree Recipients

SEX	RACE	NEWS/ EDITORIAL	ADVERTISING	MASS MEDIA	OTHER
MALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				
FEMALE:	Majority (White)				
	Minority				
	Do Not Know Race				

Part 4:

4

1. Does your academic unit currently have affirmative action goals for the recruitment of:

	(Circle One)	
a. Faculty	YES	NO
b. Graduate Students	YES	NO

2. If YES, state those goals.

3. If NO, is there a likelihood of establishing affirmative action goals in the near future? (Circle One) YES NO

4. If YES, at this time, can you estimate what they will be?

5. Please rate the difficulty of this response form.

(Circle One)

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	slightly difficult	moderately difficult	very difficult	extremely difficult

6. Do you feel the results of this study may be of benefit to your academic unit in establishing or meeting affirmative action guidelines? (Circle One) YES NO

7. If YES, indicate your name and address below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix D

Phase I Cover Letters

Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

College of Communications and Fine Arts

March 14, 1979

The College of Communications and Fine Arts at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale is conducting a study on the availability of women and racial minorities for faculty positions in the College. As you may know, the availability data provided by affirmative action offices to establish hiring goals for faculty are aggregated across academic units. The data, therefore, frequently do not apply to the curricular divisions of an individual school or departmental unit. The results of our study will be used to build a more representative data base for the projection of faculty affirmative action goals. Your participation in filling out the enclosed reponse form will allow us to determine the proportion of women and racial minority group members in the faculty work force.

If you are concerned with meeting affirmative action requirements, the results should be of benefit to you. Results will be made available to respondents.

The response form is complicated and will take a little of your time. The utility of the results, however, should be well worth the investment. The information you provide will be kept in strictest confidence and your anonymity preserved. Please take time to complete the response form--today if you can--and mail it back in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to write me at the above address or call me at (618) 453-2291. Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ken E. Askew Jr.

Ken E. Askew, Jr., Research Director
CCFA Affirmative Action Project

jk

Enclosures: (1) Response Form
(1) Envelope

Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

College of Communications and Fine Arts

Dear Colleague:

The College of Communications and Fine Arts at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale still needs your assistance. Many of you have already responded to our March 14th letter regarding affirmative action "availability" information. Because of the time and difficulty of retrieving graduate student records, many responses have been slow in arriving. As you know, an affirmative action program requires action. You can help our honest and sincere effort at affirmative action by completing the enclosed response form. If you will not be able to provide the information we need, you can help by returning a note indicating why. Please take the time to return a response in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to write me at the above address or call me at (618) 453-2291. Your immediate attention will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ken E. Askew Jr.

Ken E. Askew, Jr.
Research Director
CCFA Affirmative Action Project

jk

Enclosures: 1 response form
1 return envelope

Appendix E

Professional Organization Membership Directories

Professional Organization Membership Directories

Music

Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities, U. S. and Canada, 1978

Radio and Television

1978 NAEB Directory of Public Telecommunications

Theater

American Theatre Association, 1979 Directory

Speech Pathology and Audiology

American Speech and Hearing Association, 1978 Directory

Speech Communication

Speech Communication Association Directory, 1979-1980

Cinema

Directory of the University Film Association, 1977

Journalism

Journalism Educator, 1977 Directory Issue

Appendix F
Phase II Questionnaire

250

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to the following items by checking the appropriate blank or writing the requested information in the space provided.

1. Sex: Female____ Male____

2. Race: Black____ Hispanic____
   Asian____ American Indian____
   White____ Other (Please Specify)_____

3. Marital Status: Single____ Married____

4. Highest academic degree received: (Please Specify)

   Degree_____ Year Received____

5. What do you consider your specialties or major areas of interest within your discipline or profession?

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. Which of the following best describes your current employer?

   ____Four year university or college
   ____Community or junior college (two year)
   ____Private practice (Please specify nature) _____
   ____Other (Please specify)
   _____

7. If employed by a university/college, what is your academic rank?

   ____Graduate Assistant
   ____Instructor/Lecturer
   ____Assistant Professor
   ____Associate Professor
   ____Full Professor
   ____Other (Please Specify)
   _____

8. If employed by a university/college, are you...?

   ____tenured
   ____tenure track, but not tenured
   ____not tenure track
   ____does not apply

9. Please estimate the likelihood that you will be changing your place of employment (for any foreseeable reason) within the next couple of years. (How mobile would you say you are?)

____	____	____	____	____
Very Likely				Not At All Likely

10. Are you now seeking a new place of employment?

____Yes ____No

11. What characteristics of what you might consider a "better" job might a university offer that would persuade you to relocate? (i.e.; salary, rank, other promotion, course load, geographic factors, a combination, etc...) Please specify in order of importance from most to least as many as appropriate.

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. All other things being equal, how far would you be willing to geographically relocate in accepting what you would consider a "better" position?

____Up to a 25 mile radius
____26 to 50 mile radius
____51 to 100 mile radius
____101 to 150 mile radius
____151 to 200 mile radius
____201 to 300 mile radius
____301 to 500 mile radius
____No Limit

13. What factors did you consider in answering question #12?

_____

_____

COMMENTS:

Appendix G

Phase II Cover Letters

Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Dear Colleague:

We need your assistance. The College of Communications and Fine Arts at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale is conducting an investigation of affirmative action problems. You can help by providing information relating to your professional status and job mobility. We are interested in finding out what job characteristics represent what you might describe as a "better" job and how far (geographically) you would consider relocating for such a job.

The data you provide will be used to assess the availability of qualified individuals for positions represented in our College. We consider this information essential to the effective implementation of an affirmative action program.

The enclosed questionaire is brief and will only take a few minutes of your time. The information you provide will be strictly confidential and your anonymity preserved. Please take time to respond to the questionaire--right now if at all possible--and mail it back in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to write me at the above address or call me at (618) 453-2291. Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ken E. Askew Jr.

Ken E. Askew Jr.
Research Director
CCFA Affirmative Action Project

Enclosures: 1 questionaire
1 return envelope

Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

College of Communications and Fine Arts

Dear Colleague:

The College of Communications and Fine Arts at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale still needs your assistance. Many of you have already responded to our May 21st letter regarding affirmative action "availability and mobility" information. As you know, equal opportunity is a problem that requires action from all of us. If you have returned the questionnaire, your contribution to our efforts at affirmative action is greatly appreciated. If you have not yet responded, please take the time to complete the questionnaire and drop it in the mail today. Enclosed you will find another copy of the questionnaire and a postage-paid return envelope for your convenience. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to write me at the above address or call me at (618) 453-2291. Thank you for helping us.

Sincerely,

Ken E. Askew Jr.

Ken E. Askew, Jr.
Research Director
CCFA Affirmative Action Project

jk

Enclosures: 1 questionnaire
1 return envelope